DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 160 HE 016 237

AUTHOR Halstead, D. Kent
TITLE How States Compare in Financial Support of Higher Education, 1982-83.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC. Educational Policy and Organization Program.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 77p.; Tables may not reproduce well due to small print.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Finance; Enrollment Trends; Financial Support; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Local Government; Models; *Resource Allocation; School Taxes; *State Aid; *State Colleges; State Government; *Tax Allocation
IDENTIFIERS Chambers (M M)

ABSTRACT

Fiscal year appropriations for 1982-1983 and supporting data are presented for comparative analysis of state financing of public higher education. M. M. Chamber's annual data on state higher education appropriations are used. The data are based on a model of state rankings for seven independent factors plus eight derived measurements, which together represent the principal state conditions and financial actions underlying and governing appropriation levels. An explanation is presented of the design of the model, measurement definitions, and analysis intended for the state and individual user. A limited macro analysis is also presented. Student load is derived by application of a college attendance ratio to state high school graduates, and enrollments are adjusted by a system cost index. The final output measure is the estimated appropriations and tuition revenues per student adjusted for load. The input factors of tax capacity, high school graduates, college attendance ratio, and system are relatively stable, while tax effort, allocation, and tuition can be altered by legislative action. These measurements are described and reported in five tables: collectively by state in alphabetical order, and independently by state rank order. Basic historical and current year data are also provided. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230160

HOW STATES COMPARE IN FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1982-83

by

D. Kent Halstead

May 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

National Institute of Education

Program on Educational Policy and Organization

HE 016 237

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the U.S. Department of Education.

Available approximately October from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. Tel. (703) 841-1212. Microfiche $.97 plus $.20 postage; hard copy $3.90 plus $1.55 UPS charge maximum.

NIE Tel. (202) 254-5928

HOW STATES COMPARE IN FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1982-83

D. Kent Halstead

This report presents current fiscal year appropriations and supporting data for comparative analysis of state financing of public higher education.[1] It is based on the fall collection of state appropriations reported by M.M. Chambers.[2] The report consists of a model of state rankings for seven independent factors plus eight derived measurements which together represent the principal state conditions and financial actions underlying and governing appropriation levels. Analysis and interpretation of the data is a state and individual users' responsibility.

The report was first published in 1976 and is distributed annually in February to the statewide agencies for postsecondary education. Hardcopy and microfiche reproduction are available from the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) System.[3] Selected data are intended to be published in The Chronicle of Higher Education.

The report includes five data tables:

#1 Seven Factors, State Rankings, Current Year
#2 Seven Factors, State Alphabetical Listing, Current Year
#3 Basic Data, State Alphabetical Listing, Current Year
#4 Seven Factors, State Alphabetical Listing, Historical
#5 Basic Data, State Alphabetical Listing, Historical

The text explains the design of the model and the analysis intended, elaborates on the measurement definitions, and presents a limited macro analysis.

Design Guidelines and Model Description

The model is intended to report the principal factors governing state support of public higher education, to indicate how these factors interrelate and their relative importance and susceptibility to change, and, through interstate comparisons, to identify benchmarks for performance appraisal. While the individual measurements are accurate, the analysis in total, focused at the state level, lacks the refinement of institutional

---

[1] Public higher education includes all public institutions listed in the Education Directory Colleges and Universities, National Center for Education Statistics. To be listed institutions must provide college-level studies, award at least an associate degree, and be accredited by a nationally recognized agency. Area vocational technical schools not meeting these criteric are excluded.

[2] M.M. Chambers, Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

[3] Available approximately July 1st from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. Tel. (703) 841-1212. Microfiche $.97 plus $.20 postage; hardcopy $3.90 plus $1.55 UPS charge maximum.

detail necessary for an authoritative study.[4/] The model should therefore be used only as an early guide to current state financing and should be followed by more rigorous and comprehensive analysis.

Six guidelines were followed in designing the model:

1. Because Chambers' data base is aggregate in nature, the model must have a state-level focus but should include adjustments to account for differences among states in mix of enrollments by institutional type, which affects overall costs and funding requirements.

2. To permit timely interpretation of the Chambers data, the model must be presented nearly concurrently with the fall publication of the Chambers report. This can be done only if the supporting data are from the previous year. (During periods of relative stability and uniform change among states, this inconsistency in data reporting periods results in only minor differences in state position compared to positions established using concurrent data. This variation is deemed of secondary importance to the need for prompt analysis.)

3. To permit early release of the model, the number of independent factors requiring supporting data must be limited without jeopardizing model validity.

4. To show the interrelationships and relative contribution of each factor to the support level achieved, the factors should be combined by formula.

5. To facilitate interstate comparisons, all factors should be identified by arranging data according to state rank and by indexing each factor relative to the U.S. average equal to 100.

6. To assist legislators in locating where corrective action is most feasible, factors should be identified as variable or nonvariable according to the relative ease or difficulty of state adjustment.

Application of these guidelines has resulted in a model of seven independent factors (three largely exogenous to the higher education system) and eight derived or dependent factors, including a final OUTPUT

4/ For detail of financing revenues and expenditures by institutional type, see Marilyn McCoy and Kent Halstead, Financing Higher Education in the Fifty States, 2nd Edition (1979 data), National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado, 1983. Distributed to state agencies for postsecondary education and for sale in a limited number of copies by NCHEMS.

measure of financial support. Four of the independent factors are classified as nonvariable and are collectively labeled INPUTS; three are adjustable by legislative action and are labeled financial PROCESS factors. The OUTPUT measure equals the INPUTS multiplied by the PROCESS factors. The factors combine in the formula as follows:

Student Enrollment (ENROL)

Resident Student Source (#1) x College Attendance Ratio (#2) x System Cost Index (#3) = Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL ADJ)

Tax Revenues (TAX)

Tax Capacity (#4) x Tax Effort (#5) / ENROL x Allocation to Public Higher Education (#6) = State and Local Appropriations per Student (APP)*

State and Local Appropriations Per Student (APP) x [Tuition Factor (#7) - 1.00] = Estimated Tuition per Student (TUITION)*

APP Adj + TUITION Adj = OUTPUT

Independent factors are numbered; dependent factors are short titled.

#4/(#1 x #2 x #3) = INPUTS

#5 x #6 x #7 = PROCESS

INPUTS x PROCESS = OUTPUT

In brief, the model explains state and local government appropriations by applying the fiscal actions of taxing effort and allocation to the state's inherent tax wealth or capacity. Student enrollment is derived by applying a college attendance ratio to state high school graduates and then adjusting by a "system cost index" to derive a measure of financial load that includes institutional funding requirements generally unrelated to student count as well as those directly associated with enrollment. An estimation of tuition per student is derived from the historical ratio (tuition factor) of tuition to appropriations.

*APP and TUITION are reported in actual dollars per student and dollars per student adjusted for additional financial load requirements unrelated to student count using the relevant components of the System Cost Index.

The final OUTPUT measure of estimated appropriations and tuition revenues per student adjusted for load represents a comparable[5/] overall support level for public higher education provided by state residents. The INPUT factors of tax capacity, high school graduates, college attendance ratio, and system cost are relatively stable, and they establish the basic economic and organizational conditions within the state under which the public higher education system must operate. The PROCESS factors of tax effort, allocation, and tuition factor, in contrast, can be altered by legislative action and constitute the financial means for yearly adjustment of state funding levels.

Application of the formula to basic data on each of the states results in the seven factors in state support of higher education reported in tables 1 and 2. Table 1 presents the factors independently by state in rank order for fiscal year 1983; table 2 presents the factors collectively by state in alphabetical order. Table 3 presents the 1983 basic data on which the measurements are calculated. Tables 4 and 5 present the factors in state alphabetical order and the basic supporting data for fiscal years 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983. These data provide opportunity for limited trend analysis.

Measurement Definitions

#1--RESIDENT STUDENT SOURCE (Public and nonpublic high school graduates per 1,000 populations.) (B/A)*

A state's high school graduates are the primary source of entering freshmen at public institutions in-state and therefore the best single starting base for deriving total enrollments.

#2--COLLEGE ATTENDANCE RATIO (Full-time equivalent enrollment in public institutions of higher education per high school graduate.) (C/B)

The college attendance ratio essentially measures the degree to which a state provides attractive public higher education opportunities to both resident and nonresident students, relative to its high school graduates. The index represents the net effect of the entrance rate of high school graduates into state institutions, in-migration of out-of-state students, the retention of students in college, and the degree to which students are enrolled part-time as opposed to full-time. The entrance of high school graduates further reflects their preparedness for college, the financial and geographical accessibility of suitable college programs, and student, parental, and community disposition toward attendance at state institutions.

5/ Comparability would be further improved by correcting for geographical differences in the prices colleges and universities pay for goods and services. Such an index, currently not available, is discussed as a note at the end of this paper.

* Letters A through H designate the eight elements of basic data described beginning on page 13 and presented in tables 3 and 5.

ENROL--STUDENT ENROLLMENT (Full-time equivalent enrollment in public institutions of higher education per 1,000 population.) (#1 x #2)

Student enrollment is an approximate load measure for placing revenues and expenditures on a per user basis. The financing required for institutional operations other than instruction--such as administration, plant operation and maintenance, libraries, public service, and research--are only indirectly proportional to the numbers of students. For universities, which emphasize these operations, student enrollment understates the actual load. On a per student basis, university programs thus appear more "costly." Since there are differences among states in enrollment mix by type of institution, it is necessary to correct for greater load, and hence for funding requirements, at universities compared to larger enrollments at the less costly 4-year and 2-year colleges. The System Cost Index performs this adjustment function.

While public enrollments represent a state government's primary student load, resident students receiving state financial aid who attend private or out-of-state institutions also constitute a load factor not counted by this measure. However, appropriated financial aid to such students has been excluded where identified thereby limiting the analysis to the public institutions within state.

#3--STATE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM COST INDEX (Constructed state and local government appropriations and tuition revenues per student which are based on application of prior year national average dollar rates by type of institution to state enrollment mix. Expressed as an index relative to the U.S. average equal to 100. Separate indexes are also reported for appropriations and tuition.) (G)

The System Cost Index is used to adjust student enrollment to derive a more accurate measure of load by taking into account additional institutional funding requirements generally unrelated to student count (e.g., administration, plant operation, research, hospitals, and public service.) The various types of institutions differ in the emphasis given to these requirements so that enrollments must be "corrected" to establish comparable loads.

The cost index recognizes differences in appropriations and tuition support requirements for 9 types of institutions--major research/hospital universities, 26 doctoral granting institutions having sponsored research programs exceeding $53 million or hospital expenditures exceeding $48 million yearly; intermediate universities, 54 remaining doctoral granting institutions not classified as either major research/hospital or small university; small universities, 29 doctoral granting institutions having less than $20 million of sponsored research and less than $100 million total educational and general expenditures; comprehensive institutions granting graduate degrees primarily at the masters level; general baccalaureate institutions awarding most degrees at the bachelors level; 2-year academic and comprehensive colleges emphasizing associate and certificate degrees; 2-year occupational colleges; health professional colleges; and other professional and specialized institutions. Institutions are classified by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems using NCES HEGIS information.

Universities with large graduate and upper division enrollments, a large senior faculty, and an emphasis on research and public service have missions that inherently require a high level of funding. Since the student count measures only a portion of this load, universities appear "expensive" to operate on a per student basis. Two-year colleges, on the other hand, are much less "costly" per student because enrollment is a fairly accurate measure of load for the mission of providing instruction at the lower division. States with proportionately more students enrolled in universities have financial loads that are 10 to 20 percent above the national average. States with proportionately more students enrolled in 4-year and 2-year colleges have system costs per student that are as much as 10 percent below the national average.

The cost index reports the relative average cost per student a state would incur for its public system if it financed enrollments at each type of institution by the national average appropriations and tuition rate per FTE student. To compute the index, a constructed financial load per student is first derived for each state by multiplying the enrollment at each type of institution within the state by the respective national average appropriation and tuition rates, summing the derived products, and dividing by the state's total enrollment. This constructed load divided by the average appropriations and tuition per student for all institutions for the U.S. equals the system cost index. Separate indexes are developed for appropriations, tuition, and total appropriations and tuition. The 1980-81 enrollment mix for each state and the national average appropriations and tuition rates per student used in index compilation are shown in the table on page 7.

A system cost index of 120, for example, means that the state enrollment pattern imposes a financial load per student that is essentially 20 percent greater than that of the national average enrollment pattern. Multiplying student enrollments by the system cost index establishes an adjusted student financial load that is based on common national average funding rates and is therefore relative to the U.S. average and comparable state-to-state. Appropriations and tuition reported per adjusted student relate dollars to a common load measure, thereby establishing comparable per student unit funding.

ENROL
ADJ--STUDENT ENROLLMENT ADJUSTED (FTE students in public institutions of higher education adjusted for system costs per 1,000 population.) (ENROL x #3)

This is a measure of the combined enrollment and cost load imposed by a state's public higher education system. Financial load is reported in FTE students adjusted for the appropriation and tuition funding requirements associated with the enrollment mix by type of institution within the state higher education system. It is assumed that a state's financial requirements for each type of institution are similar to national average appropriation and tuition rates. Where this is true, this measure establishes interstate comparability of load.

State public FTE enrollment percentage distribution by type of institution and national average state and local government appropriations and tuition rates per student, 1980-81.

State	Maj.Res/ Hosp U	Univ	Small U	Comp	Gen.BA	Two-yr Acad	Two-yr Occup	Health Prof	Other Prof	
ALABAMA	8.9%	27.9%	.0%	36.3%	.7%	22.0%	3.4%	.0%	.8%	
ALASKA	.0%	25.0%	.0%	19.9%	.0%	46.4%	5.7%	.0%	3.0%	
ARIZONA	22.0%	24.3%	.0%	8.0%	.0%	44.2%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	
ARKANSAS	.0%	26.0%	.0%	38.5%	16.9%	11.2%	3.0%	2.3%	.0%	
CALIFORNIA	10.7%	2.1%	.7%	26.4%	.0%	55.8%	3.0%	.4%	.2%	
COLORADO	.0%	34.3%	9.1%	12.7%	17.6%	22.0%	.6%	1.2%	2.5%	
CONNECTICUT	.0%	28.3%	.0%	36.5%	.0%	26.8%	7.5%	.0%	.0%	
DELAWARE	.0%	69.3%	.0%	.0%	7.0%	.0%	22.9%	.0%	.0%	
D.C.	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
FLORIDA	13.7%	16.6%	.0%	14.4%	.0%	55.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
GEORGIA	.0%	27.0%	12.2%	26.1%	4.5%	24.7%	.9%	1.7%	2.1%	
HAWAII	.0%	50.1%	.0%	.0%	9.5%	20.1%	20.4%	.0%	.0%	
IDAHO	.0%	.0%	28.3%	50.1%	5.6%	16.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
ILLINOIS	11.0%	12.2%	11.0%	13.3%	.0%	51.1%		1.4%	.0%	
INDIANA	21.0%	19.8%	11.5%	28.2%	2.6%	3.5%	10.7%	.0%	2.8%	
IOWA	26.6%	27.1%	.0%	11.5%	.0%	17.0%	17.0%	.0%	.0%	
KANSAS	.0%	42.2%	.0%	26.9%	4.7%	23.5%	.4%	2.2%	.0%	
KENTUCKY	22.0%	17.7%	.0%	38.2%	8.2%	12.3%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	
LOUISIANA	.0%	21.7%	.0%	64.9%	4.4%	.7%	6.1%	2.2%	.0%	
MAINE	.0%	.0%	.0%	63.4%	8.2%	6.6%	12.2%	.0%	9.6%	
MARYLAND	.0%	24.7%	.0%	23.4%	9.3%	37.9%	1.4%	3.3%	.0%	
MASSACHUSETTS	.0%	17.5%	.0%	32.1%	14.5%	28.8%	4.9%	.3%	1.9%	
MICHIGAN	23.9%	7.5%	5.7%	19.5%	6.7%	33.7%	3.1%	.0%	.0%	
MINNESOTA	39.3%	.0%	.0%	36.1%	3.6%	19.5%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	
MISSISSIPPI	.0%	14.5%	24.9%	13.7%	6.0%	34.0%	4.0%	2.1%	.0%	
MISSOURI	18.3%	.0%	6.4%	39.0%	5.0%	24.9%	.2%	.0%	5.5%	
MONTANA	.0%	.0%	.0%	68.5%	12.0%	6.4%	.0%	.0%	13.1%	
NEBRASKA	.0%	39.5%	.0%	28.6%	7.7%		20.1%	4.0%	.0%	
NEVADA	.0%	.0%	.0%	65.4%	.0%	34.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	.0%	.0%	54.8%	.0%	28.1%	.0%	17.0%	.0%	.0%	
NEW JERSEY	.0%	16.4%	.0%	37.0%	5.3%	30.6%	6.9%	1.1%	2.6%	
NEW MEXICO	.0%	68.2%	.0%	17.2%	.0%	10.2%	4.3%	.0%	.0%	
NEW YORK	.0%	12.1%	2.8%	30.4%	5.0%	33.0%	12.4%	1.5%	2.8%	
NORTH CAROLINA	11.0%	10.0%	4.9%	25.3%	7.6%	6.0%	35.0%	.0%	.2%	
NORTH DAKOTA	.0%	.0%	30.2%	29.1%	11.9%	9.1%	13.0%	.0%	5.9%	
OHIO	26.5%	.0%	33.6%	12.5%	1.0%	12.4%	13.7%	.2%	.1%	
OKLAHOMA	.0%	39.9%	.0%	15.3%	17.1%	23.8%	1.5%	2.4%	.0%	
OREGON	.0%	17.4%	16.3%	15.4%	1.6%	10.0%	33.0%	1.3%	5.1%	
PENNSYLVANIA	11.5%	24.2%	.0%	29.3%	3.9%	22.8%	8.0%	.2%	.1%	
RHODE ISLAND	.0%	45.6%	.0%	24.2%	.0%	30.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
SOUTH CAROLINA	.0%	36.0%	.0%	7.7%	19.1%	2.5%	32.6%	2.1%	.0%	
SOUTH DAKOTA	.0%	.0%	27.9%	30.0%	26.0%	1.2%	4.0%	.0%	10.1%	
TENNESSEE	.0%	21.4%	12.7%	35.4%	3.4%	14.4%	10.4%	2.1%	.2%	
TEXAS	16.3%	9.2%	5.7%	29.1%	1.0%	31.6%	5.4%	1.7%	.0%	
UTAH	.0%	58.5%	.0%	.0%	20.4%	6.4%	14.7%	.0%	.0%	
VERMONT	.0%	.0%	.0%	65.5%	24.3%	4.9%	5.4%	.0%	.0%	
VIRGINIA	17.9%	12.3%	.0%	29.6%	5.5%	21.3%	13.3%	.0%	.0%	
WASHINGTON	21.2%	11.1%	.0%	15.3%	1.6%	39.3%	11.5%	.0%	.0%	
WEST VIRGINIA	.0%	33.5%	.0%	16.3%	36.2%	1.4%	8.0%	.4%	2.1%	
WISCONSIN	21.2%	10.5%	.0%	35.1%	3.9%	4.2%	25.1%	.0%	.0%	
WYOMING	.0%	.0%	55.0%	.0%	.0%	45.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
U.S. AVERAGE	10.8%	14.9%	5.1%	25.0%	4.5%	29.2%	8.0%	.8%	.8%	National average
St & Loc Approp/Student	$4,987	$3,863	$2,909	$2,883	$2,399	$2,031	$2,266	$26,220	$3,242	$3,102
Tuition Rev/Student	1,373	1,163	1,222	832	905	468	576	1,729	1,140	836
Approp & Tuition/Student	6,361	5,026	4,131	3,715	3,305	2,499	2,843	27,949	4,382	3,938

#4--TAX CAPACITY (Potential state and local tax revenue as measured by "representative tax system" per capita.) (D/A)

This index measures the ability or potential of state and local governments to obtain revenues for public purposes through various kinds of taxes. The wealth of local residents is only one source of tax revenues; therefore, this measurement is not equivalent to per capita personal income. Tax capacity is measured here by a representative tax system that defines the tax capacity of a state and its local governments as the amount of revenue they could raise (relative to other state-local governments) if every state-local system applied identical tax rates (national averages) to their respective tax bases. The sum of capacities for all states equals the U.S. total tax revenues collected.

#5--TAX EFFORT (State and local government tax revenues collected as a percent of state and local tax capacity.) (E/D)

Tax effort measures the percentage of state and local government tax capacity that is actually used. The tax revenues collected for all states equals total tax capacity nationwide. Since the nationwide effort measure, by definition, is 100 percent, the measures for individual states indicate how they compare in tax collection performance with the national average.

TAX--TAX REVENUES (State and local tax revenue collected per capita.) (#4 x #5)

Collected tax revenues represent the wealth available to state and local governments for public use. The index essentially identifies "rich" versus "poor" states according to current tax income. However, these designations must be tempered by the fact that some states have far greater social needs than others. This increases the competition for funding among alternative uses so that even "rich" states may experience scarce dollars in financing certain public programs. Some apparently "poor" states, on the other hand, may have less than average public service requirements so that support dollars are more readily available. Also price differences among the states affect the purchasing power of government revenues. Although a "geographical price index" is not currently available, its importance warrants discussion, as is noted at the conclusion of this paper.

#6--ALLOCATION TO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION (percent of state and local government collected tax revenues that are appropriated or levied for operating expenses of public higher education.) (F/E)

This ratio suggests the relative importance of financing public higher education to the funding of other public services in the state and local government budget. The case for greater allocation must be made against competing claims of other public service programs. Accordingly, evidence that education should receive a greater share of the state budget is suggested by relatively lower appropriations per student compared with more favorable unit funding of other public services.

APP--APPROPRIATIONS PER STUDENT (State and local tax revenues appropriated or levied for current operating expenses of public higher education per FTE public student. Reported in actual dollars per student and in dollars per student adjusted for system cost.) (TAX x #6/ENROL)

This measure of appropriations[6/] relative to enrollment and financial load suggests the commitment of tax revenues of state and local governments to support public higher education consistent with available funds and expressed need. The level of appropriations should be judged as the major source of funding for public institutions. However, since some states rely heavily on student tuition to offset lower appropriations, total funding from both sources should be recognized as a more comprehensive measure of support for interstate comparisons.

Also reported is the FY 1978 to FY 1983 5-year trend of appropriations per actual student in constant dollars. The deflator used was the increase in the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI)[7/] for FY 1978 to 1982 and an estimate of 8 percent for FY 1982 to 1983 for a derived 5-year inflation rate of 56 percent. Dividing FY 1983 by FY 1978 appropriations and then by 1.56 equals the 5-year percent change of appropriations in dollars of constant institutional purchasing power.

#7--TUITION FACTOR (Ratio of prior year state and local government appropriations plus student tuition revenues to state and local government appropriations.) (H)

This immediate past ratio is used to estimate current year tuition revenues and calculate appropriations and tuition as the total financial support for higher education. Higher ratios often reflect a large proportion of out-of-state students paying higher non-resident tuition rates. To some extent, the ratio reflects the balance a state places on the returns of higher education to the individual versus society and the resulting expected proportional payment. High values reflect the position that the individual is the primary benefactor of his education and that students and their parents should, accordingly, pay for most of the costs. Low values reflect the position that large social benefits result from higher education and that state and local governments should recognize these returns through a high appropriation subsidy.

TUITION--ESTIMATED TUITION PER STUDENT (Tuition revenues of public higher education per FTE public student. Reported in actual dollars per student and in dollars per student adjusted for system cost.) APP (TUITION FACTOR - 1.00)

Tuition revenues will be underestimated or overestimated if student charges have been increased disproportionately to increase in appropriations since the tuition factor was computed (1980-81). Since tuition charges vary by type of institution, the mix of

---

6/ See "Basic Data Description" section for description of appropriations collected by M. M. Chambers.

7/ The Higher Education Price Index is published annually in September by Research Associates of Washington, 2605 Klingle Rd. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

institutions within a state public higher education system will effect revenues from this source. To establish interstate comparability, actual tuition dollars per student are corrected by the tuition component of the System Cost Index (#3). In addition to the effect on tuition levels of arguments about benefits and who should pay, high tuition can be justified during financial difficulties by the need to fully tap every source. Yet many states believe high tuition is inimical to the basic concept of equal opportunity, and they establish low charges to provide easy access and prevent financial hardship.

OUTPUT--APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATED TUITION REVENUES PER STUDENT ADJUSTED (Estimated student tuition payments and state and local tax revenues appropriated for current operating expenses of public higher education per FTE student adjusted for system cost.) (APP + TUITION)**

Tuition and appropriations, which reflect the primary financial commitment of state residents (and non-resident attending students) to support public higher education, account for 88.6 percent of current operating expense revenues (current funds revenues minus government grants and contracts and sales and service revenues) of public institutions. As adjusted by the System Cost Index, the dollar amounts per student are generally comparable state-by-state except that no correction has been made for differences in costs due to geography. Variations in the level of support contribute to the quality and amount of education, research, and services provided, and reflect efficiency of operations and economies of scale achieved by larger state systems.

INPUTS--POTENTIAL TAX REVENUES PER STUDENT ADJUSTED (Potential tax dollars per FTE student adjusted for system cost.) (#4/#1 X #2 X #3)

The four input factors (resident student source, college attendance ratio, system cost index, and tax capacity) together establish a state's basic tax potential to finance public higher education relative to student enrollment load. These factors are relatively stable inherent state conditions generally subject to only modest or slow alteration. States with high INPUT levels have great economic potential to finance public higher education through a combination of high tax capacity and relatively low student enrollment. States with a low capacity load ratio must fully tap a modest potential if public institutions are to be adequately supported.

** Appropriations (APP) and tuition (TUITION) are separately converted from actual dollars per FTE student to dollars per adjusted FTE student using the relevant components of the System Cost Index. The final OUTPUT measure reports appropriations plus tuition revenues adjusted by the System Cost Total Index. However, adjusted appropriations added to adjusted tuition does not exactly equal the adjusted total dollar OUTPUT. This is because the sum of parts each adjusted by an individual index does not exactly equal the total adjusted by a single total index. This inconsistency must be accommodated when more than one index of this type is employed.

PROCESS--COLLECTIVE FINANCIAL ACTIONS (Percent utilization of INPUT factors to equal OUTPUT. (#5 X #6 X #7)

The combined PROCESS factors (tax effort, allocation to public higher education, and tuition factor) are the financial actions that establish the degree to which the INPUT potential tax dollars per student are actually utilized to achieve the OUTPUT support level provided. These three factors are subject to modification through legislative and/or institutional decisions. States with high PROCESS levels are making a great effort to finance public higher education, often because of low INPUT conditions. States with low PROCESS percentages either can afford to do so because of excellent INPUT conditions or are satisfied with relatively low financing.

Analysis Procedure and Findings

The model presented here is designed for the study of public higher education financing by individual states. The model can be used for the following analyses: (1) establishment of a state's relative position for each of the seven independent factors and determination of the consequences of a high or low position on the dependent conditions (enrollment, tax revenues, and tuition) and on final appropriations and tuition OUTPUT; (2) review of the status of INPUT conditions to determine the desirability of long-run change; (3) review of the financial PROCESS factors to determine possible immediate legislative action; (4) selection of peer states and comparison study to identify benchmarks or goals; and (5) trend analysis of factor values to determine improvement or retrograde change and to develop projections for planning.

Beyond this micro-focus on individual state analysis, some general observations can be made here regarding the overall (macro) role of state governments and citizens in financing public higher education.

Variance. Variance is defined here as the three year historical average of the means of the high and low deviations from the national average, excluding those few states with extreme values. PROCESS factors, which are subject to yearly adjustment, show greater variance than the more stable INPUT factors. Factor #6, Allocation, has the greatest variance, ±56 percent (+70%, -43%), followed by factor #5, Tax Effort, ±27%; and factor #7, Tuition Factor, ±22%. This greater latitude in allocation practices among states contributes more to the variation in resulting funding levels than any other fiscal action.

The INPUT factor showing greatest variance is factor #2, College Attendance Ratio, ±31%; followed by factor #4, Tax Capacity, ±25%; factor #1 Resident Student Source, ±25%; and factor #3, System Cost Index, ±21%. A wide range of attendance rates have been achieved by the states, some states becoming heavily involved in the "business" of higher education, and others choosing to be "debtors" by encouraging their residents to attend college elsewhere.

Relationship Between OUTPUT, INPUTS, AND PROCESS. INPUTS and PROCESS factors have an inverse relationship. States with high INPUTS can and generally do have low PROCESS values. Yet the INPUT conditions are so favorable that the resulting OUTPUT usually remains high. Thus, wealthy states with few students generally provide higher than average financing.

States with low INPUT conditions must and do have high PROCESS actions that produce a wide range of OUTPUT levels. Poor states with many students must struggle to raise even average-level appropriations and tuition.

Key INPUT Factors. States with high tax dollars per student (adjusted) INPUT levels usually have a good Tax Capacity plus a combined low College Attendance Ratio and low System Cost Index resulting in a low student load. Low INPUT levels are usually the result of an above average College Attendance Ratio and System Cost Index resulting in a high student load, plus average to low Tax Capacity. The College Attendance Ratio is the most important INPUT factor; it also exhibits the greatest range. Thus, over an extended period, the states have established widely varying responses in defining their obligation to provide educational opportunity to their residents and in their ability to attract nonresidents.

Key PROCESS Factors. Of the three PROCESS factors, the Allocation Rate, as expected, is the strongest financial action taken by states in financing higher education. States with a high PROCESS level allocate large percentages of their collected tax revenues to higher education, although there are many exceptions (e.g., Vermont which relies on a high Tuition Factor). Low PROCESS states invariably have low Allocation Rates. Neither Tax Effort nor the Tuition Factor appears to correlate significantly with the final PROCESS level. No state has high values for all three PROCESS factors. Arizona comes closest, ranking 11th in Tax Effort, 13th in Allocation Rate, and 20th in the Tuition Factor.

Wealth and System Cost. With the exception of Hawaii, the seven richest states in the union in tax revenues operate the least expensive public higher education systems. Alaska, New York, Wyoming, District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and California emphasize attendance at 4-year and 2-year colleges with resulting system funding requirements (at national average rates) from 5 to 23 percent below the U.S. norm. Where funding requirements are high in Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Indiana, New Mexico, and a number of other states, the cause is a historically predominant university structure and a relatively small 2-year college system rather than inherent state wealth.

Relationship Between Appropriations and Tuition. High appropriations can be accompanied by either high tuition (New York) or low tuition (District of Columbia). Low appropriations, however, are often compensated for by high student charges as in the case of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Colorado.

Achievement Records. Seven states--Arizona, Mississippi, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Alabama, Utah, South Carolina--have done the most with the least. Ranking lowest in INPUTS and highest in PROCESS, these seven states have done their best to respond to an exceptionally difficult financing challenge. New York also deserves special notice for having responded to high INPUT conditions (11th), not with a typical low PROCESS level but with an equally high PROCESS (18th).

In terms of performing least with the most, New Hampshire has high INPUT conditions (10th) yet responds with an extremely low PROCESS (50th) leading to a low OUTPUT (47th).

Trends. The time span of five years for which data is provided is sufficient to reflect minor trends. The data of tables 4 and 5 for fiscal years 1978, 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983 generally reflect modest and irregular changes. Occasionally a sharper consistent change in one or more measures may occur in a particular state. These should be noted and the consequences of their possible continuation considered.

Of special importance is the maintenance of purchasing power. The five-year change in appropriations per student in constant dollars is reported in table 1. Inflation of 56 percent for 1978-83 was estimated based on the 1978-82 change in the Higher Education Price Index and a one year projection for 1982-1983 of 8 percent. Nationally there was a 7.7 percent loss in appropriations per student in real dollars for the five year period. In eighteen states the purchasing power of appropriations per student was reduced by more than 15 percent. This erosion in financing is an exceptionally serious problem which should be fully documented by the states affected.

Basic Data Description and Release Schedule

The eight elements of data used in the model are identified by an alphabetical letter and described below. The release or publication dates of the data are shown in the following diagram, and the sources for the data are listed below.

	Reporting Date/Period Year 1	Release Dates Year 2
A. Population	July 81	Feb. 82
B. High School Graduates	Spring 81	Sept. 82
C. Enrollment	Fall 81	June 82
D. Tax Capacity	Fiscal Year 81	Sept. 82
E. Tax Revenues		
F. Appropriations Fiscal Year 83		Nov./Dec. FY 83
G. Tuition Factor	Fiscal Year 81	Oct. 82
H. System Cost Index		

A. Resident Population, in thousands.

Source: Current Population Reports: Population Estimates and Projections, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

B. High School Graduates (Public and nonpublic). Excludes equivalency certificates and graduates from other programs.

Source: Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools and Statistics of State School Systems, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.

C. Full-Time-Equivalent Enrollment in Public Institutions of Higher Education.

Source: Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 19--, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.

FTE enrollment as collected by HEGIS equals full-time students plus FTE of part-time students as determined by reporting institutions. FTE enrollment was reviewed by State Higher Education Finance Officers (SHEFO) in every state.

D. State and Local Government Tax Capacity, in thousands.

Source: Preliminary 1981 Estimates, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

E. State and Local Government Tax Revenue Collected, in thousands.

Source: Preliminary 1981 Estimates, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

F. State and Local Government Tax Revenues Appropriated or Levied for Operating Expenses of Public Higher Education, in thousands.

Source: Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education, 19--, M.M. Chambers, Office of Research and Information, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C. Appropriations were reviewed by State Higher Education Finance Officers (SHEFO) in every state.
Local government data are collected by the Council for Postsecondary Education, State of Washington, Olympia, Washington.

Chambers' measure of state tax appropriations is supplemented in this analysis by the addition of local government tax appropriations to higher education. In addition, state tax appropriations going to independent higher education institutions and for financial aid to students attending private or out-of-state institutions (when identified) have been subtracted from the Chambers appropriations total, since the focus here is on support

to the public sector. Also, appropriations for vocational-technical schools which do not offer college-level studies (not listed in the NCES Education Directory) have been excluded when identified since their enrollments are not reported by HEGIS. Appropriations have been adjusted to amounts as of January 1, 1983.

Appropriations as collected by Chambers exclude sums derived from any source other than state tax funds. Appropriations for capital outlay are excluded; only sums appropriated for operating expenses are included. Also excluded are tuition charges collected by the institution and remitted to the state as an offset to the state appropriation. Sums destined for higher education but appropriated to some other state agency are included, as are sums appropriated to statewide coordinating boards or agencies, state scholarships or other student financial aid, and aid to local public community colleges and for vocational-technical 2-year colleges or for institutions that are predominantly for high school graduates and adult students.

This definition includes appropriations for all activities and support elements of higher education within a state including medical centers and teaching hospitals, research institutes and laboratories, agricultural experiment stations, cooperative extension service, public television, intercollegiate athletics, board of regents, coordinating commission, student aid, fringe benefits, etc. The funding of these support operations are only indirectly related to student count. To the extent that the financial requirements of these activities among states are proportional to enrollment mix by type of institution, adjustment of enrollments by the System Cost Index establishes reasonably equivalent unit financial load and hence interstate comparability of funding per adjusted student.

G. State Higher Education System Cost Index.

Source: Derived from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics finance and enrollment data. Institutions classifed and data computed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) Boulder, Colorado. Contact Officer: Paul Brinkman.

H. Tuition Factor.

Source: Appropriations--see F. above.
Tuition and fees--Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.

Comparability of Data

The significant technical and structural differences among states in their postsecondary education systems, financing structures, and accounting practices reduce the validity of comparative studies. Substantial progress is being made toward reducing technical differences by tightening definitions and encouraging responsible reporting and state review. Inherent structural differences, however, cannot be equated by improved data collection. Comparability here is usually established by "adjusting"

the data in some manner to account for the different ways in which the states organize to provide higher education. Here, also, progress is being made by improvements in the System Cost Index used in this model. But a serious problem of universe definition remains.

Outlined below, in order of seriousness, are the major remaining problems impairing the comparability of data used in this study. Some of these problems cannot be resolved because of the conflict between the complexities of financing higher education and a model limited by the intended purposes of this study. But problems of a technical nature could be resolved simply by refinement of definitions by collecting agencies and reporting institutions.

Structural Problems

1. The higher education universe used in this study is defined by the Education Directory, Colleges and Universities published by the National Center for Education Statistics. The Directory includes 2-year vocational-technical institutes that are nationally accredited and that award associate degrees. Encrollment in this universe includes only students taking degree credit courses. The Directory excludes vocational-technical institutes and area vocational centers that are not accredited and do not award an associate degree.

Because the included and excluded vocational-technical institutes have some similar programs, there is inconsistency in the institutionl universe at the program level. And since entire state systems of these types of institutions fall in one category or the other, the problem is significant. States with a sizeable proportion of enrollments in technical institutes excluded from the universe are: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and Washington. For these states, the exclusion of such schools results in a lower attendance rate, a higher system cost index, a lower allocation rate, and higher appropriations and tuition per student than would have occurred had they been included.

This inconsistency in the universe from a program standpoint and its effect on the indexes of this study are recognized. However, at present, argument in favor of continued use of the higher education universe as defined by the NCES Directory is persuasive. In most states the excluded vocational-technical institutes are not considered an integral part of the higher education system. They are usually independently organized, planned, and funded. More important, these schools are strictly occupationally oriented with little or no general education or collegiate mission, and they are not accredited; two fundamental attributes of all institutions in the higher education universe. Thus for most states exclusion of these institutes is reasonable and defendable from both a practical and philosophical standpoint.

2. Tax revenues as reported in this study do not represent the total fiscal resources available to a state to support public services. Nontax revenues* and Federal revenue sharing funds, which vary greatly from state to state, are not included. Although these revenues are often designated for special uses, they may offset the need for tax funds for other public service requirements including higher education. Thus total revenues may be a more valid measure of state resources available to support public higher education than tax revenues alone. Arguments against inclusion of nontax revenues are based on two factors: (1) taxes are the near-exclusive source of revenues for appropriations for higher education, and (2) tax rates and hence total tax revenues are probably not significantly affected by the amount of nontax revenues collected.

3. This study presents total tuition payments without distinguishing between resident and nonresident components, which clouds the interpretation of average tuition. State with a large proportion of nonresident students have a reported average tuition level that is substantially above that for residents. This composite average can easily be misunderstood. However, the purpose here is to report the financial role of aggregate tuition, and no inference of precise per-student tuition rates should be made from the data.

4. A number of secondary factors that indirectly influence state financing of higher education are not considered in the model given its focus on early reporting and analysis of basic data. The principal factor that is excluded is the private sector and its role in providing postsecondary education opportunities that complement and thereby offset state public higher education responsibilities. States with large private sectors recognize the shared responsibility to residents and design their public systems accordingly. The multiple effects of a strong in-state private sector on virtually all of the factors in this model are not now taken into account, although possible adjustments in the model for this purpose are being studied.

Also, there are no adjustments for the effects on financing of certain physical factors that vary among states, and this, too, reduces the comparability of data. These factors include population density and the resulting need for multiple, dispersed institutions to provide geographical accessibility, institutional sizes and resulting economies of scale, geographical price differences in the goods and services purchased by colleges and universities, and the effect of location on heating and cooling requirements, snow removal, and the like.

---

*Nontax revenues are receipts from such diverse sources as fees and charges, rents, fines, interest earnings, and net profits from government-operated utilities, gas and water companies, and liquor stores. Tuition payments are a form of nontax revenue.

Finally, there are a number of effects on funding requirements and thus in comparability caused by variations in financing practices. Capital expenditures is one example. Although the appropriations presented exclude plant investment, the approach used by each state to finance capital costs influences its current operations funding. Some states finance capital costs through direct appropriations to institutions, others through revenue bonds or direct state expenditures. At least one state uses tuition appropriations for operations than would be needed if tuition were used for this purpose.

Technical Problems

1. Appropriations for public services, for research and experiment stations, and for university hospitals vary considerable among the states. These variations result from differences in providing citizens with the specialized services of state universities. Comparability is impaired when a few states provide a level of support that far exceeds the norm, most notably for indigent patient care. To avoid distortion of state appropriations, these exceptional amounts should be adjusted to conform to the average.

2. Opening fall FTE enrollment does not represent a full year student load and the NCES Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) does not establish a standard definition for "full-time-equivalent student." The varying size of summer school programs are not reflected in a single enrollment count. Fall enrollment understates the student load for states with large summer school programs, and overstates load where summer programs are small. To the extent that institutions use different formulas for identifying FTE's, their FTE enrollment data lack comparability. Most institutions likely use similar conversions of part-time to full-time-equivalents (roughly one-third), which reduces the seriousness of this inconsistency. However, standardized conversion, perhaps by type of institution, would materially improve the comparability of this critical data component.

3. The state appropriations and student tuition revenues used in this study to compile the Tuition Factor are based on gross amounts from each source as collected by Chambers and NCES. Total revenues may therefore be overstated to the extent that student financial aid is counted both as an appropriation and as a tuition revenue.

4. In some states, tuition and fees and/or sales and service revenues are remitted to the state and then legislatively reappropriated to the institution. NCES and Chambers give specific instructions that such remitted amounts should be deducted from the gross state appropriations amount and added to the respective original source amount. These instructions have not always been followed with resulting overstatement of appropriations.

5. Sums destined for colleges and universities but appropriated to another agency should be added to state appropriations for higher education. Until recently, some states failed to report fringe benefits so disbursed; however, this appears to have been corrected. However, some states defer the financing of retirement benefits, which understates current year contributions.

SPECIAL NOTE

The model presented in this study is intended to include the basic measurable factors affecting state financing of higher education. An eighth factor--a geographical price index--is recognized as an important future addition. This Special Note defines this index and explains how interstate comparisons of financial data would be improved by its use.

GEOGRAPHICAL PRICE INDEX (An index to reflect differences in purchasing power among states due to geographical variation in the prices paid by colleges and universities for the same goods and services.) Currently unavailable.

The cost of providing public education varies considerably from state to state. Because higher education is labor intensive, much of this variation is due to differences in wages paid to faculty and administrators. Wages vary across the country as the result of such factors as unionization, the urbanization of an area, differences in cost of living, and the climate and social attractiveness of an area, among others. Prices paid by colleges and universities for raw materials, energy, construction, and equipment also vary depending on proximity to supplier and local demand.

A geographical price index would compare the prices paid for the same goods and services in different locations, where the amount and quality of these goods and services are equal. (The fact that the business of higher education is conducted somewhat differently from one place to another because climate and terrain impose different requirements for heating, colling, snow removal, etc., is not considered in a price index.) For higher education, a price index would report differences among states in the prices paid for exactly the same mix of faculty and administrators of equivalent quality performing the same work, together with the prices paid for all other items of fixed description purchased in the educational market basket. The difficulty of holding quality constant has prevented construction of such an index, although some investigation has been made.

A geographical price index could be used to adjust state and local government appropriations and tuition revenues to reflect equivalent purchasing power. From exploratory studies, values of a price index for public services have ranged from as much as 45 percent above the national average (Alaska) to 20 percent below for a number of states. Approximately 15 states might exceed ±10% of the national average. Given this degree of variance, interstate comparability of higher education financing would be vastly improved if such an index were available.

Table 1 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1982-83

#1 Resident Student Source High School Graduates Spring 1981

		High School Grads per 1,000 Population	Index
1.	MINNESOTA	16.5	126
2.	NORTH DAKOTA	16.2	123
3.	SOUTH DAKOTA	16.1	122
4.	IOWA	16.0	122
5.	WISCONSIN	15.8	120
6.	NEBRASKA	15.5	117
7.	MAINE	15.4	117
8.	MASSACHUSETTS	15.2	115
9.	MONTANA	15.2	116
10.	CONNECTICUT	15.0	114
11.	MICHIGAN	15.0	114
12.	OHIO	14.8	112
13.	DELAWARE	14.7	112
14.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	14.6	111
15.	NEW JERSEY	14.5	110
16.	HAWAII	14.4	109
17.	INDIANA	14.4	109
18.	PENNSYLVANIA	14.4	110
19.	MARYLAND	14.3	109
20.	NEW MEXICO	14.2	108
21.	VERMONT	14.2	108
22.	ILLINOIS	13.7	104
23.	MISSOURI	13.7	104
24.	IDAHO	13.5	103
25.	RHODE ISLAND	13.5	102
26.	ALASKA	13.4	102
27.	ARKANSAS	13.4	101
28.	UTAH	13.4	102
29.	VIRGINIA	13.2	100
30.	KANSAS	13.1	99
31.	NEW YORK	13.1	100
32.	LOUISIANA	13.0	99
33.	SOUTH CAROLINA	13.0	98
34.	OKLAHOMA	12.9	98
35.	WYOMING	12.8	97
36.	COLORADO	12.7	97
37.	KENTUCKY	12.6	96
38.	MISSISSIPPI	12.6	95
39.	WASHINGTON	12.6	96
40.	ALABAMA	12.5	94
41.	WEST VIRGINIA	12.5	95
42.	NORTH CAROLINA	12.4	94
43.	GEORGIA	12.3	93
44.	TENNESSEE	12.2	92
45.	TEXAS	12.1	92
46.	OREGON	11.5	87
47.	NEVADA	11.1	84
48.	CALIFORNIA	11.0	84
49.	D.C.	10.2	78
50.	ARIZONA	10.1	76
51.	FLORIDA	9.7	74
	UNITED STATES	13.2	100

#1. Resident Student Source. High school graduates per 1,000 population (B/A). This is the primary source of entering freshmen at public institutions in the state and is therefore the best single starting base for deriving total enrollments. (INPUT factor)

#2 College Attendance Ratio Fall 1981

		FTE Public Students per High School Graduate	Index
1.	ARIZONA	4.23	189
2.	CALIFORNIA	3.69	165
3.	OREGON	3.15	141
4.	WASHINGTON	3.02	135
5.	COLORADO	2.94	132
6.	KANSAS	2.88	129
7.	NORTH DAKOTA	2.74	123
8.	DELAWARE	2.62	117
9.	OKLAHOMA	2.57	115
10.	MISSISSIPPI	2.56	115
11.	TEXAS	2.56	115
12.	ALABAMA	2.52	113
13.	NORTH CAROLINA	2.51	113
14.	VIRGINIA	2.50	112
15.	WYOMING	2.45	110
16.	HAWAII	2.44	109
17.	WISCONSIN	2.42	108
18.	UTAH	2.41	108
19.	NEVADA	2.37	106
20.	FLORIDA	2.32	104
21.	MICHIGAN	2.27	102
22.	MONTANA	2.25	101
23.	NEW MEXICO	2.22	99
24.	WEST VIRGINIA	2.22	99
25.	NEBRASKA	2.21	99
26.	ILLINOIS	2.16	97
27.	ALASKA	2.13	95
28.	LOUISIANA	2.13	95
29.	SOUTH CAROLINA	2.11	95
30.	TENNESSEE	2.11	94
31.	MARYLAND	2.09	94
32.	IDAHO	2.01	90
33.	SOUTH DAKOTA	1.98	89
34.	RHODE ISLAND	1.95	87
35.	KENTUCKY	1.94	87
36.	VERMONT	1.93	86
37.	INDIANA	1.86	83
38.	MINNESOTA	1.85	83
39.	MISSOURI	1.84	82
40.	IOWA	1.83	82
41.	NEW YORK	1.81	81
42.	OHIO	1.79	80
43.	GEORGIA	1.72	77
44.	ARKANSAS	1.69	76
45.	NEW JERSEY	1.57	70
46.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	1.54	69
47.	MASSACHUSETTS	1.45	65
48.	MAINE	1.42	64
49.	CONNECTICUT	1.40	63
50.	PENNSYLVANIA	1.34	60
51.	D.C.	1.28	57
	UNITED STATES	2.23	100

#2. College Attendance Ratio. Full-time-equivalent enrollment in public institutions of higher education per high school graduate (C/B). This ratio measures the degree to which a state provides attractive and accessible opportunities for higher education to both in-state and out-of-state students relative to size of its resident student source. (INPUT factor)

ENROL Student Enrollment Fall 1981 (#1 X #2)

		FTE Public Students per 1,000 Population	Index
1.	NORTH DAKOTA	44.3	150
2.	ARIZONA	42.6	145
3.	CALIFORNIA	40.7	138
4.	DELAWARE	38.6	131
5.	WASHINGTON	38.1	129
6.	WISCONSIN	38.1	129
7.	KANSAS	37.8	128
8.	COLORADO	37.4	127
9.	OREGON	36.1	123
10.	HAWAII	35.1	119
11.	MONTANA	34.3	116
12.	NEBRASKA	34.2	116
13.	MICHIGAN	33.9	115
14.	OKLAHOMA	33.1	112
15.	VIRGINIA	33.0	112
16.	UTAH	32.4	110
17.	MISSISSIPPI	32.1	109
18.	SOUTH DAKOTA	31.8	108
19.	NEW MEXICO	31.5	107
20.	WYOMING	31.5	107
21.	ALABAMA	31.3	107
22.	NORTH CAROLINA	31.1	106
23.	TEXAS	31.0	106
24.	MINNESOTA	30.7	104
25.	MARYLAND	30.0	102
26.	ILLINOIS	29.7	101
27.	IOWA	29.3	100
28.	ALASKA	28.5	97
29.	WEST VIRGINIA	27.8	94
30.	LOUISIANA	27.7	94
31.	SOUTH CAROLINA	27.6	94
32.	VERMONT	27.5	93
33.	IDAHO	27.2	93
34.	INDIANA	26.8	91
35.	OHIO	26.5	90
36.	NEVADA	26.2	89
37.	RHODE ISLAND	26.2	89
38.	TENNESSEE	25.6	87
39.	MISSOURI	25.3	86
40.	KENTUCKY	24.6	84
41.	NEW YORK	23.7	81
42.	NEW JERSEY	22.8	77
43.	ARKANSAS	22.6	77
44.	FLORIDA	22.6	77
45.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	22.6	77
46.	MASSACHUSETTS	22.1	75
47.	MAINE	21.8	74
48.	GEORGIA	21.1	72
49.	CONNECTICUT	21.0	71
50.	PENNSYLVANIA	19.3	66
51.	D.C.	13.1	45
	UNITED STATES	29.4	100

ENROL Student Enrollment. Full-time-equivalent students in public institutions of higher education per 1,000 population (#1 x #2). This is an approximate load measure for placing revenues for current operating expenses on a per user unit basis. The financing required for administration, plant operation and maintenance, libraries, public service and research are only indirectly proportional to the number of students.

Table 1 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1982-83

#3 System Cost Index 1980-81

	Approp.	Tuition	Total
1. NEBRASKA	130	114	127
2. MINNESOTA	113	115	113
3. KANSAS	115	107	113
4. LOUISIANA	113	107	112
5. INDIANA	110	121	112
6. NEW MEXICO	110	119	112
7. OKLAHOMA	114	107	112
8. IOWA	111	113	111
9. DELAWARE	108	119	111
10. ARKANSAS	112	107	111
11. MARYLAND	113	97	110
12. KENTUCKY	108	114	109
13. OHIO	105	122	109
14. TENNESSEE	109	107	109
15. SOUTH CAROLINA	109	105	108
16. TEXAS	109	102	107
17. UTAH	104	117	106
18. GEORGIA	106	107	106
19. COLORADO	103	110	105
20. WISCONSIN	103	107	104
21. WEST VIRGINIA	99	113	102
22. PENNSYLVANIA	101	103	102
23. ARIZONA	102	102	102
24. MISSISSIPPI	102	102	102
25. MICHIGAN	100	104	101
26. ALABAMA	100	105	101
27. ILLINOIS	101	96	100
28. VIRGINIA	99	102	100
29. RHODE ISLAND	98	103	99
30. OREGON	99	102	99
31. HAWAII	97	104	99
32. CONNECTICUT	100	98	96
33. MISSOURI	98	105	99
34. WASHINGTON	97	96	97
35. NEW JERSEY	95	92	95
36. D.C.	92	98	94
37. SOUTH DAKOTA	89	115	94
38. NEW YORK	95	89	94
39. NORTH CAROLINA	93	99	94
40. NEW HAMPSHIRE	85	121	93
41. MONTANA	90	101	93
42. FLORIDA	92	90	91
43. IDAHO	87	105	91
44. NORTH DAKOTA	86	107	91
45. MASSACHUSETTS	89	93	90
46. MAINE	88	96	90
47. ALASKA	87	89	88
48. VERMONT	86	97	88
49. WYOMING	80	104	86
50. CALIFORNIA	87	82	86
51. NEVADA	83	84	84
UNITED STATES	100	100	100

#3. System Cost Index. Constructed state and local government appropriations and tuition revenue per student based on application of prior year national average dollar rates by type of institution to state enrollment mix (G). Used to derive a more accurate measure of financial load by taking into account institutional funding requirements for research, public service, and other functions generally unrelated to student count. (INPUT factor)

ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted Fall 1981 (ENROL x #3)

	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 Population	Index
1. NEBRASKA	43.4	148
2. ARIZONA	43.4	148
3. DELAWARE	42.8	145
4. KANSAS	42.7	145
5. NORTH DAKOTA	40.3	137
6. WISCONSIN	39.6	135
7. COLORADO	39.2	133
8. OKLAHOMA	37.0	126
9. WASHINGTON	36.9	126
10. OREGON	35.7	122
11. NEW MEXICO	35.3	120
12. CALIFORNIA	35.0	119
13. MINNESOTA	34.7	118
14. HAWAII	34.7	118
15. MICHIGAN	34.3	117
16. UTAH	34.3	117
17. TEXAS	33.2	113
18. VIRGINIA	33.0	112
19. MARYLAND	33.0	112
20. MISSISSIPPI	32.8	111
21. IOWA	32.5	111
22. MONTANA	31.9	108
23. ALABAMA	31.7	108
24. LOUISIANA	31.0	105
25. INDIANA	30.0	102
26. SOUTH DAKOTA	29.9	101
27. SOUTH CAROLINA	29.8	101
28. ILLINOIS	29.7	101
29. NORTH CAROLINA	29.2	99
30. OHIO	28.9	98
31. WEST VIRGINIA	28.3	96
32. TENNESSEE	27.9	95
33. WYOMING	27.1	92
34. KENTUCKY	26.8	91
35. RHODE ISLAND	25.9	88
36. ARKANSAS	25.1	85
37. ALASKA	25.1	85
38. MISSOURI	25.0	85
39. IDAHO	24.8	84
40. VERMONT	24.2	82
41. NEW YORK	22.3	76
42. GEORGIA	22.3	76
43. NEVADA	22.0	75
44. NEW JERSEY	21.6	74
45. NEW HAMPSHIRE	21.0	71
46. CONNECTICUT	20.8	71
47. FLORIDA	20.6	70
48. MASSACHUSETTS	19.9	67
49. MAINE	19.7	67
50. PENNSYLVANIA	19.7	67
51. D.C.	12.3	42
UNITED STATES	29.4	100

ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted. Combined enrollment and cost load imposed by a state's public higher education system (ENROL x #3). Financial load is reported in FTE students adjusted for the appropriation and tuition funding requirements associated with the enrollment mix by type of institution within the state public higher education system.

#4 Tax Capacity 1981

	Dollars per Capita	Index
1. ALASKA	3,333	324
2. WYOMING	2,226	216
3. NEVADA	1,523	148
4. TEXAS	1,360	132
5. OKLAHOMA	1,311	127
6. NORTH DAKOTA	1,271	123
7. LOUISIANA	1,200	117
8. CALIFORNIA	1,186	115
9. NEW MEXICO	1,169	114
10. MONTANA	1,168	113
11. COLORADO	1,161	113
12. D.C.	1,143	111
13. DELAWARE	1,142	111
14. CONNECTICUT	1,132	110
15. KANSAS	1,125	109
16. NEW JERSEY	1,078	105
17. HAWAII	1,076	105
18. ILLINOIS	1,070	104
19. IOWA	1,053	102
20. FLORIDA	1,041	101
21. MINNESOTA	1,031	100
22. WASHINGTON	1,021	99
23. OREGON	1,019	99
24. MARYLAND	1,009	98
25. NEBRASKA	997	97
26. MICHIGAN	990	96
27. MASSACHUSETTS	989	96
28. NEW HAMPSHIRE	982	95
29. OHIO	972	94
30. VIRGINIA	969	94
31. MISSOURI	948	92
32. WISCONSIN	936	91
33. INDIANA	932	91
34. PENNSYLVANIA	931	90
35. WEST VIRGINIA	926	90
36. NEW YORK	916	89
37. ARIZONA	913	89
38. IDAHO	891	87
39. UTAH	890	86
40. SOUTH DAKOTA	888	86
41. VERMONT	864	84
42. KENTUCKY	844	82
43. ARKANSAS	840	82
44. GEORGIA	838	81
45. RHODE ISLAND	827	80
46. NORTH CAROLINA	819	80
47. MAINE	816	79
48. TENNESSEE	813	79
49. SOUTH CAROLINA	774	75
50. ALABAMA	767	74
51. MISSISSIPPI	737	72
UNITED STATES	1,029	100

#4. Tax Capacity. The potential of state and local governments to obtain revenues for public purposes through various kinds of taxes (D/A). Measured by a "representative tax system" that defines the tax capacity of a state and its local governments as the amount of revenue they could raise if all 50 state-local systems applied identical tax rates (national averages) to their respective tax bases. (INPUT factor)

Table 1 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1982-83

#5 Tax Effort 1981

		Percent	Index
1.	ALASKA	184.5	184
2.	NEW YORK	171.0	171
3.	D.C.	145.5	145
4.	MASSACHUSETTS	134.0	134
5.	RHODE ISLAND	129.9	130
6.	HAWAII	125.7	126
7.	WISCONSIN	120.3	120
8.	MICHIGAN	116.1	116
9.	MAINE	113.2	113
10.	NEW JERSEY	111.7	112
11.	MINNESOTA	108.8	109
12.	MARYLAND	107.4	107
13.	ARIZONA	105.9	106
14.	VERMONT	105.2	105
15.	ILLINOIS	105.0	105
16.	PENNSYLVANIA	104.8	105
17.	CONNECTICUT	102.7	103
18.	OREGON	101.2	101
19.	CALIFORNIA	100.3	100
20.	IOWA	98.2	98
21.	GEORGIA	97.3	97
22.	UTAH	97.0	97
23.	SOUTH CAROLINA	95.3	95
24.	NORTH CAROLINA	95.3	95
25.	NEBRASKA	94.8	95
26.	MISSISSIPPI	94.6	95
27.	SOUTH DAKOTA	92.9	93
28.	MONTANA	92.4	92
29.	WASHINGTON	92.1	92
30.	ALABAMA	90.6	91
31.	VIRGINIA	89.5	89
32.	NEW MEXICO	89.1	89
33.	OHIO	88.7	89
34.	INDIANA	88.5	88
35.	KENTUCKY	88.4	88
36.	KANSAS	87.0	87
37.	IDAHO	87.0	87
38.	TENNESSEE	87.0	87
39.	DELAWARE	86.8	87
40.	COLORADO	83.6	84
41.	WEST VIRGINIA	83.1	83
42.	MISSOURI	81.2	81
43.	ARKANSAS	78.9	79
44.	LOUISIANA	76.7	77
45.	NORTH DAKOTA	74.0	74
46.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	73.9	74
47.	FLORIDA	73.3	73
48.	OKLAHOMA	72.6	73
49.	WYOMING	72.5	73
50.	TEXAS	64.6	65
51.	NEVADA	61.6	62
	UNITED STATES	100.0	100

#5 Tax Effort. State and local tax revenue collected as a percentage of state and local tax capacity (E/DI). Tax effort measures, as a percentage, how much of state and local government tax capacity is actually used. The tax revenue collected for all states equals total tax capacity nationwide, so that the national effort, by definition, is 100 percent. Effort measures for the individual states indicate how they compare with the national average. (PROCESS factor)

TAX Tax Revenue 1981 (#4 x #5)

		Dollars per Capita	Index
1.	ALASKA	6,148	597
2.	D.C.	1,662	161
3.	WYOMING	1,614	157
4.	NEW YORK	1,567	152
5.	HAWAII	1,353	131
6.	MASSACHUSETTS	1,325	129
7.	NEW JERSEY	1,204	117
8.	CALIFORNIA	1,190	116
9.	CONNECTICUT	1,162	113
10.	MICHIGAN	1,150	112
11.	WISCONSIN	1,125	109
12.	ILLINOIS	1,124	109
13.	MINNESOTA	1,121	109
14.	MARYLAND	1,084	105
15.	MONTANA	1,079	105
16.	RHODE ISLAND	1,075	104
17.	NEW MEXICO	1,041	101
18.	IOWA	1,034	100
19.	OREGON	1,031	100
20.	DELAWARE	992	96
21.	KANSAS	979	95
22.	PENNSYLVANIA	975	95
23.	COLORADO	970	94
24.	ARIZONA	967	94
25.	OKLAHOMA	952	92
26.	NEBRASKA	945	92
27.	NORTH DAKOTA	941	91
28.	WASHINGTON	940	91
29.	NEVADA	938	91
30.	MAINE	923	90
31.	LOUISIANA	921	89
32.	VERMONT	909	88
33.	TEXAS	878	85
34.	VIRGINIA	867	84
35.	UTAH	863	84
36.	OHIO	862	84
37.	INDIANA	825	80
38.	SOUTH DAKOTA	825	80
39.	GEORGIA	815	79
40.	NORTH CAROLINA	780	76
41.	IDAHO	775	75
42.	WEST VIRGINIA	770	75
43.	MISSOURI	770	75
44.	FLORIDA	762	74
45.	KENTUCKY	746	72
46.	SOUTH CAROLINA	737	72
47.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	725	70
48.	TENNESSEE	707	69
49.	MISSISSIPPI	698	68
50.	ALABAMA	694	67
51.	ARKANSAS	663	64
	UNITED STATES	1,029	100

TAX Tax Revenue. State and local tax revenue collected per capita (#4 x #5). Collected tax revenue represents the wealth available to state and local governments for public use. The index essentially identifies "rich" versus "poor" states according to the size of their current tax income. State wealth such as nontax revenues from government fees and charges for selling certain public services are not included.

#6 Allocation to Public Higher Education 1982-83

		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index
1.	NORTH CAROLINA	17.2	165
2.	NORTH DAKOTA	16.9	162
3.	MISSISSIPPI	16.4	157
4.	TEXAS	16.2	155
5.	SOUTH CAROLINA	15.4	148
6.	UTAH	15.0	144
7.	KANSAS	14.7	140
8.	ALABAMA	14.6	140
9.	WYOMING	14.3	137
10.	NEW MEXICO	14.1	135
11.	NEBRASKA	13.9	133
12.	HAWAII	13.9	134
13.	ARIZONA	13.6	130
14.	KENTUCKY	13.3	127
15.	OKLAHOMA	13.1	126
16.	DELAWARE	13.0	124
17.	IDAHO	12.8	123
18.	VIRGINIA	12.7	122
19.	COLORADO	12.5	120
20.	CALIFORNIA	12.5	120
21.	ARKANSAS	12.3	117
22.	LOUISIANA	12.1	116
23.	WEST VIRGINIA	12.1	116
24.	IOWA	12.1	116
25.	GEORGIA	11.8	113
26.	TENNESSEE	11.8	113
27.	MONTANA	11.4	109
28.	WISCONSIN	11.4	109
29.	OREGON	11.2	107
30.	WASHINGTON	11.2	107
31.	FLORIDA	10.9	104
32.	INDIANA	10.8	103
33.	MARYLAND	10.2	98
34.	SOUTH DAKOTA	9.5	90
35.	NEVADA	9.5	91
36.	MISSOURI	9.3	89
37.	MINNESOTA	9.2	88
38.	MICHIGAN	8.6	82
39.	ILLINOIS	8.5	81
40.	RHODE ISLAND	8.3	80
41.	OHIO	8.2	78
42.	PENNSYLVANIA	7.5	72
43.	NEW JERSEY	7.1	68
44.	VERMONT	7.0	67
45.	MAINE	6.9	66
46.	NEW YORK	6.9	66
47.	CONNECTICUT	6.8	65
48.	ALASKA	5.9	56
49.	D.C.	5.8	55
50.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	5.2	50
51.	MASSACHUSETTS	4.5	43
	UNITED STATES	10.4	100

#6. Allocation to Public Higher Education. State and local tax revenue appropriated or levied for current operating expenses of public higher education (F/E). This ratio suggests the relative importance of financing public higher education to the funding of other public services in the state and local government budgets. The case for greater allocation must be made against competing claims of other public service programs. (PROCESS factor)

Table 1 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1982-83

APP
Appropriations per Student 1982-83 (TAX x #6/ENROL)

	Dollars per Student Actual	Dollars per Student Adjusted*	Index	Five Year Constant Dollar Change
1. ALASKA	12,662	14,554	398	+ 9.8
2. WYOMING	7,354	9,192	251	+ 37.6
3. D.C.	7,348	7,987	219	+ 40.8
4. HAWAII	5,376	5,543	152	+ 11.6
5. NEW YORK	4,578	4,819	132	- 2.4
6. NORTH CAROLINA	4,321	4,646	127	- 25.7
7. GEORGIA	4,582	4,323	118	- 3.6
8. NEW MEXICO	4,644	4,222	116	- 5.6
9. CALIFORNIA	3,666	4,213	115	+ 10.9
10. TEXAS	4,588	4,209	115	- 14.6
11. IDAHO	3,646	4,191	115	+ 14.6
12. NORTH DAKOTA	3,589	4,173	114	+ 2.3
13. NEVADA	3,394	4,089	112	- 16.5
14. FLORIDA	3,663	3,982	109	+ 13.6
15. MONTANA	3,580	3,978	109	- 10.5
16. NEW JERSEY	3,764	3,962	108	- 2.7
17. IOWA	4,287	3,862	106	+ 2.5
18. UTAH	3,996	3,843	105	- 3.8
19. SOUTH CAROLINA	4,126	3,785	104	- 7.7
20. CONNECTICUT	3,756	3,756	103	- 18.7
21. KENTUCKY	4,041	3,742	102	+ 1.2
22. PENNSYLVANIA	3,777	3,740	102	- 11.9
23. LOUISIANA	4,022	3,559	97	- 12.8
24. MISSISSIPPI	3,566	3,496	96	+ 18.0
25. RHODE ISLAND	3,416	3,485	95	- 13.2
26. WEST VIRGINIA	3,351	3,385	93	- 4.1
27. VIRGINIA	3,343	3,377	92	+ 35.3
28. OKLAHOMA	3,776	3,312	91	- 6.2
29. KANSAS	3,800	3,304	90	- 15.4
30. MAINE	2,906	3,303	90	- 0.8
31. WISCONSIN	3,364	3,266	89	- 3.3
32. MARYLAND	3,681	3,257	89	- 15.8
33. ALABAMA	3,229	3,229	88	- 29.0
34. OREGON	3,194	3,226	88	- 16.9
35. ARKANSAS	3,594	3,209	88	- 0.5
36. ILLINOIS	3,224	3,192	87	- 18.3
37. COLORADO	3,254	3,159	86	- 14.3
38. DELAWARE	3,336	3,088	84	- 15.1
39. MASSACHUSETTS	2,716	3,052	84	- 1.7
40. ARIZONA	3,097	3,037	83	+ 0.4
41. INDIANA	3,318	3,016	83	- 1.5
42. TENNESSEE	3,246	2,978	81	+ 3.0
43. MINNESOTA	3,350	2,965	81	- 18.3
44. NEBRASKA	3,852	2,963	81	- 18.7
45. MICHIGAN	2,914	2,914	80	- 4.8
46. MISSOURI	2,824	2,881	79	- 18.2
47. WASHINGTON	2,764	2,850	78	- 21.5
48. SOUTH DAKOTA	2,456	2,759	75	- 15.9
49. VERMONT	2,308	2,683	73	- 18.7
50. OHIO	2,666	2,539	69	- 29.2
51. NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,663	1,957	54	- 24.1
UNITED STATES	3,655	3,655	100	- 7.7

*Actual Dollars/Cost Index for App

APP Appropriations per Student. State and local tax revenue appropriated for current operating expenses of public higher education per actual FTE student and per FTE student adjusted for financial load (TAX x #6/ENROL). Reports the commitment of tax revenue as the major source of funding for public institutions consistent with available funds and expressed need. Constant dollars are based on the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

#7
Tuition Factor 1980-81

	Factor Value	Index
1. VERMONT	2.44	194
2. NEW HAMPSHIRE	2.21	175
3. PENNSYLVANIA	1.56	124
4. OHIO	1.54	122
5. DELAWARE	1.53	121
6. MICHIGAN	1.52	121
7. COLORADO	1.50	119
8. MAINE	1.47	117
9. SOUTH DAKOTA	1.40	111
10. MARYLAND	1.38	110
11. RHODE ISLAND	1.37	109
12. INDIANA	1.36	108
13. MASSACHUSETTS	1.36	108
14. OREGON	1.34	106
15. WISCONSIN	1.34	106
16. VIRGINIA	1.32	105
17. ARIZONA	1.30	103
18. MINNESOTA	1.30	103
19. NEW JERSEY	1.30	103
20. IOWA	1.29	102
21. ALABAMA	1.28	102
22. MISSOURI	1.28	102
23. NEW YORK	1.27	101
24. TENNESSEE	1.27	101
25. NEBRASKA	1.26	100
26. UTAH	1.26	100
27. ARKANSAS	1.25	99
28. MISSISSIPPI	1.25	99
29. NORTH DAKOTA	1.25	99
30. KENTUCKY	1.24	98
31. FLORIDA	1.23	98
32. ILLINOIS	1.23	98
33. KANSAS	1.22	97
34. MONTANA	1.22	97
35. CONNECTICUT	1.21	96
36. GEORGIA	1.21	96
37. NEVADA	1.21	96
38. SOUTH CAROLINA	1.21	96
39. WASHINGTON	1.20	95
40. LOUISIANA	1.19	94
41. NEW MEXICO	1.19	94
42. OKLAHOMA	1.19	94
43. IDAHO	1.17	93
44. WEST VIRGINIA	1.16	92
45. TEXAS	1.15	91
46. NORTH CAROLINA	1.14	90
47. WYOMING	1.12	89
48. HAWAII	1.11	88
49. CALIFORNIA	1.10	87
50. ALASKA	1.09	87
51. D.C.	1.05	83
UNITED STATES	1.26	100

#7. Tuition Factor. Ratio of state and local government appropriations plus student tuition revenue to state and local government appropriations 84. This immediate past ratio suggests the relative importance of student tuition as a funding source compared to state local appropriations, and thus, to some extent, reflects the balance a state places on the returns of higher education to the individual versus society and resulting expected proportional payment. (PROCESS factor)

TUITION 1982-83
Estimated Tuition per Student APP (Tuition Factor - 1.00)

	Dollars per Student Actual	Dollars per Student Adjusted*	Index
1. VERMONT	3,323	3,426	361
2. PENNSYLVANIA	2,115	2,054	216
3. NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,013	1,663	175
4. DELAWARE	1,768	1,486	156
5. COLORADO	1,627	1,479	156
6. MICHIGAN	1,515	1,457	153
7. MARYLAND	1,398	1,442	152
8. MAINE	1,366	1,423	150
9. NEW YORK	1,236	1,389	146
10. ALASKA	1,140	1,280	135
11. NEW JERSEY	1,129	1,227	129
12. RHODE ISLAND	1,264	1,227	129
13. OHIO	1,440	1,180	124
14. IOWA	1,243	1,100	116
15. WISCONSIN	1,144	1,069	113
16. OREGON	1,086	1,065	112
17. MASSACHUSETTS	978	1,052	111
18. VIRGINIA	1,070	1,049	110
19. INDIANA	1,194	987	104
20. FLORIDA	843	936	99
21. ARIZONA	929	911	96
22. GEORGIA	862	899	95
23. UTAH	1,039	888	93
24. NEBRASKA	1,002	879	92
25. MINNESOTA	1,005	874	92
26. MISSISSIPPI	891	874	92
27. ALABAMA	904	861	91
28. SOUTH DAKOTA	982	854	90
29. KENTUCKY	970	851	90
30. NEVADA	713	849	89
31. WYOMING	882	848	89
32. ARKANSAS	898	840	88
33. NORTH DAKOTA	897	838	88
34. SOUTH CAROLINA	866	825	87
35. TENNESSEE	876	819	86
36. CONNECTICUT	789	805	85
37. KANSAS	836	781	82
38. MONTANA	788	780	82
39. ILLINOIS	741	772	81
40. MISSOURI	791	753	79
41. NEW MEXICO	882	741	78
42. LOUISIANA	764	714	75
43. TEXAS	688	675	71
44. OKLAHOMA	717	671	71
45. NORTH CAROLINA	605	611	64
46. IDAHO	620	590	62
47. WASHINGTON	553	576	61
48. HAWAII	591	569	60
49. WEST VIRGINIA	536	474	50
50. CALIFORNIA	367	447	47
51. D.C.	367	375	39
UNITED STATES	950	950	100

*Actual Dollars/Cost Index for Tuition

TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student. Tuition revenues of public higher education per FTE public student APP (Tuition Factor-1.00). Since tuition charges vary by type of institution, the interstate comparability of average tuition per student is improved by using the tuition component of the System Cost Index to adjust for the effect on tuition of enrollment mix.

Table 1 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1982-83

OUTPUT 1982-83
Appropriations & Est Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP+TUITION)

		Dollars per Student Adjusted*	Index
1.	ALASKA	15,684	341
2.	WYOMING	9,577	208
3.	D.C.	8,208	178
4.	VERMONT	6,399	139
5.	NEW YORK	6,185	134
6.	HAWAII	6,028	131
7.	PENNSYLVANIA	5,777	125
8.	NORTH CAROLINA	5,240	114
9.	GEORGIA	5,231	114
10.	NEW JERSEY	5,150	112
11.	IOWA	4,982	108
12.	FLORIDA	4,951	108
13.	NEW MEXICO	4,934	107
14.	TEXAS	4,931	107
15.	NORTH DAKOTA	4,930	107
16.	NEVADA	4,889	106
17.	UTAH	4,750	103
18.	MAINE	4,747	103
19.	RHODE ISLAND	4,727	103
20.	MONTANA	4,697	102
21.	CALIFORNIA	4,688	102
22.	IDAHO	4,688	102
23.	COLORADO	4,649	101
24.	SOUTH CAROLINA	4,623	100
25.	MARYLAND	4,618	100
26.	DELAWARE	4,598	100
27.	KENTUCKY	4,598	100
28.	CONNECTICUT	4,590	100
29.	VIRGINIA	4,413	96
30.	MICHIGAN	4,385	95
31.	MISSISSIPPI	4,370	95
32.	WISCONSIN	4,335	94
33.	OREGON	4,323	94
34.	LOUISIANA	4,273	93
35.	MASSACHUSETTS	4,106	89
36.	KANSAS	4,103	89
37.	ALABAMA	4,092	89
38.	ARKANSAS	4,047	88
39.	INDIANA	4,029	87
40.	OKLAHOMA	4,012	87
41.	ILLINOIS	3,965	86
42.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	3,953	86
43.	ARIZONA	3,948	86
44.	MINNESOTA	3,854	84
45.	NEBRASKA	3,822	83
46.	WEST VIRGINIA	3,811	83
47.	TENNESSEE	3,782	82
48.	OHIO	3,766	82
49.	SOUTH DAKOTA	3,657	79
50.	MISSOURI	3,651	79
51.	WASHINGTON	3,419	74
	UNITED STATES	4,605	100

*Actual Dollars/System Cost Index

OUTPUT Appropriations and Estimated Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted. Estimated student tuition payments and state and local tax revenues appropriated for current operating expenses of public higher education per FTE student adjusted for system cost (APP + TUITION). Appropriations and tuition reflect the primary financial commitment of state residents to support public higher education.

INPUTS
Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/#1x#2x#3)

		Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index
1.	ALASKA	133,034	380
2.	D.C.	92,703	265
3.	WYOMING	82,204	235
4.	NEVADA	69,153	198
5.	CONNECTICUT	54,365	155
6.	FLORIDA	50,587	145
7.	NEW JERSEY	49,819	142
8.	MASSACHUSETTS	49,783	142
9.	PENNSYLVANIA	47,208	135
10.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	46,698	133
11.	MAINE	41,502	119
12.	NEW YORK	41,052	117
13.	TEXAS	40,945	117
14.	LOUISIANA	38,675	111
15.	MISSOURI	37,884	108
16.	GEORGIA	37,562	107
17.	MONTANA	36,640	105
18.	ILLINOIS	36,061	103
19.	IDAHO	35,943	103
20.	VERMONT	35,767	102
21.	OKLAHOMA	35,396	101
22.	CALIFORNIA	33,857	97
23.	OHIO	33,648	96
24.	ARKANSAS	33,472	96
25.	NEW MEXICO	33,125	95
26.	WEST VIRGINIA	32,689	93
27.	IOWA	32,394	93
28.	RHODE ISLAND	31,911	91
29.	NORTH DAKOTA	31,549	90
30.	KENTUCKY	31,510	90
31.	INDIANA	31,104	89
32.	HAWAII	30,982	89
33.	MARYLAND	30,549	87
34.	MINNESOTA	29,738	85
35.	SOUTH DAKOTA	29,737	85
36.	COLORADO	29,584	85
37.	VIRGINIA	29,409	84
38.	TENNESSEE	29,104	83
39.	MICHIGAN	28,886	83
40.	OREGON	28,514	81
41.	NORTH CAROLINA	28,041	80
42.	WASHINGTON	27,641	79
43.	DELAWARE	26,689	76
44.	KANSAS	26,361	75
45.	SOUTH CAROLINA	25,960	74
46.	UTAH	25,935	74
47.	ALABAMA	24,220	69
48.	WISCONSIN	23,624	68
49.	NEBRASKA	22,956	66
50.	MISSISSIPPI	22,487	64
51.	ARIZONA	21,041	60
	UNITED STATES	34,991	100

INPUTS Potential Tax Revenue per Student Adjusted. The combined input factors establish a state's basic tax potential to finance public higher education relative to student enrollment load (#4/#1 x #2 x #3). The four factors are relatively stable inherent state conditions subject to only modest or slow alteration. States with high INPUT levels have great economic potential to finance education through a combination of high tax capacity and relatively low student enrollment.

PROCESS
Collective Financial Actions (#5x#6x#7)

		Percent	Index
1.	HAWAII	19.5	148
2.	MISSISSIPPI	19.4	148
3.	ARIZONA	18.8	143
4.	NORTH CAROLINA	18.7	142
5.	UTAH	18.3	139
6.	WISCONSIN	18.3	139
7.	VERMONT	17.9	136
8.	SOUTH CAROLINA	17.8	135
9.	DELAWARE	17.2	131
10.	ALABAMA	16.9	128
11.	NEBRASKA	16.6	126
12.	COLORADO	15.7	119
13.	KANSAS	15.6	118
14.	NORTH DAKOTA	15.6	119
15.	IOWA	15.4	117
16.	MICHIGAN	15.2	115
17.	OREGON	15.2	115
18.	MARYLAND	15.1	115
19.	NEW YORK	15.1	114
20.	VIRGINIA	15.0	114
21.	NEW MEXICO	14.9	113
22.	RHODE ISLAND	14.8	113
23.	KENTUCKY	14.6	111
24.	GEORGIA	13.9	106
25.	CALIFORNIA	13.8	105
26.	IDAHO	13.0	99
27.	INDIANA	13.0	98
28.	MINNESOTA	13.0	98
29.	TENNESSEE	13.0	99
30.	MONTANA	12.8	97
31.	WASHINGTON	12.4	94
32.	SOUTH DAKOTA	12.3	93
33.	PENNSYLVANIA	12.2	93
34.	ARKANSAS	12.1	92
35.	TEXAS	12.0	92
36.	ALASKA	11.8	90
37.	WEST VIRGINIA	11.7	89
38.	WYOMING	11.7	89
39.	MAINE	11.4	87
40.	OKLAHOMA	11.3	86
41.	OHIO	11.2	85
42.	ILLINOIS	11.0	84
43.	LOUISIANA	11.0	84
44.	NEW JERSEY	10.3	79
45.	FLORIDA	9.8	74
46.	MISSOURI	9.6	73
47.	D.C.	8.9	67
48.	NEW HAMPSHIRE	8.5	64
49.	CONNECTICUT	8.4	64
50.	MASSACHUSETTS	8.2	63
51.	NEVADA	7.1	54
	UNITED STATES	13.2	100

FINANCIAL PROCESS Collective Financial Actions. The combined PROCESS factors are the financial actions that establish the degree to which the INPUT potential tax dollars per student are actually utilized to achieve the OUTPUT support level provided (#5 x #6 x #7). States with high PROCESS levels are making a substantial combined tax effort, allocation to education, and tuition charges to finance public higher education.

PROCESS = OUTPUT / INPUTS

Table 2 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1983

	#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
	High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
ALABAMA	12.5	94%	2.52	113%	31.3	107%	100	105	101	31.7	108%	767	74%	90.6	91%	694	67%
ALASKA	13.4	102	2.13	95	28.5	97	87	89	88	25.1	85	3,333	324	184.5	184	6,148	597
ARIZONA	10.1	76	4.23	189	42.6	145	102	102	102	43.4	148	913	89	105.9	106	967	94
ARKANSAS	13.4	101	1.69	76	22.6	77	112	107	111	25.1	85	840	82	78.9	79	663	64
CALIFORNIA	11.0	84	3.69	165	40.7	138	87	82	86	35.0	119	1,186	115	100.3	100	1,190	116
COLORADO	12.7	97	2.94	132	37.4	127	103	110	105	39.2	133	1,161	113	83.6	84	970	94
CONNECTICUT	15.0	114	1.40	63	21.0	71	100	98	99	20.8	71	1,132	110	102.7	103	1,162	113
DELAWARE	14.7	112	2.62	117	38.6	131	108	119	111	42.8	145	1,142	111	86.8	87	992	96
D.C.	10.2	78	1.28	57	13.1	45	92	98	94	12.3	42	1,143	111	145.5	145	1,662	161
FLORIDA	9.7	74	2.32	104	22.6	77	92	90	91	20.6	70	1,041	101	73.3	73	762	74
GEORGIA	12.3	93	1.72	77	21.1	72	106	107	106	22.3	76	838	81	97.3	97	815	79
HAWAII	14.4	109	2.44	109	35.1	119	97	104	99	34.7	118	1,075	105	125.7	126	1,353	131
IDAHO	13.5	103	2.01	90	27.2	93	87	105	91	24.8	84	891	87	87.0	87	775	75
ILLINOIS	13.7	104	2.16	97	29.7	101	101	96	100	29.7	101	1,070	104	105.0	105	1,124	109
INDIANA	14.4	109	1.86	83	26.8	91	110	121	112	30.0	102	932	91	88.5	88	825	80
IOWA	16.0	122	1.83	82	29.3	100	111	113	111	32.5	111	1,053	102	98.2	98	1,034	100
KANSAS	13.1	99	2.88	129	37.8	128	115	107	113	42.7	145	1,125	109	87.0	87	979	95
KENTUCKY	12.6	96	1.94	87	24.6	84	108	114	109	26.8	91	844	82	88.4	88	746	72
LOUISIANA	13.0	99	2.13	95	27.7	94	113	107	112	31.0	105	1,200	117	76.7	77	921	89
MAINE	15.4	117	1.42	64	21.8	74	88	96	90	19.7	67	816	79	113.2	113	923	90
MARYLAND	14.3	109	2.09	94	30.0	102	113	97	110	33.0	112	1,009	98	107.4	107	1,084	105
MASSACHUSETTS	15.2	115	1.45	65	22.1	75	89	93	90	19.9	67	989	96	134.0	134	1,325	129
MICHIGAN	15.0	114	2.27	102	33.9	115	100	104	101	34.3	117	990	96	116.1	116	1,150	112
MINNESOTA	16.5	126	1.85	83	30.7	104	113	115	113	34.7	118	1,031	100	108.8	109	1,121	109
MISSISSIPPI	12.6	95	2.56	115	32.1	109	102	102	102	32.8	111	737	72	94.6	95	698	68
MISSOURI	13.7	104	1.84	82	25.3	86	98	105	99	25.0	85	948	92	81.2	81	770	75
MONTANA	15.2	116	2.25	101	34.3	116	90	101	93	31.9	108	1,168	113	92.4	92	1,079	105
NEBRASKA	15.5	117	2.21	99	34.2	116	130	114	127	43.4	148	997	97	94.8	95	945	92
NEVADA	11.1	84	2.37	106	26.2	89	83	84	84	22.0	75	1,523	148	61.6	62	938	91
NEW HAMPSHIRE	14.6	111	1.54	69	22.6	77	85	121	93	21.0	71	982	95	73.9	74	725	70
NEW JERSEY	14.5	110	1.57	70	22.8	77	95	92	95	21.6	74	1,078	105	111.7	112	1,204	117
NEW MEXICO	14.2	108	2.22	99	31.5	107	110	119	112	35.3	120	1,169	114	89.1	89	1,041	101
NEW YORK	13.1	100	1.81	81	23.7	81	95	89	94	22.3	76	916	89	171.0	171	1,567	152
NORTH CAROLINA	12.4	94	2.51	113	31.1	106	93	99	94	29.2	99	819	80	95.3	95	780	76
NORTH DAKOTA	16.2	123	2.74	123	44.3	150	86	107	91	40.3	137	1,271	123	74.0	74	941	91
OHIO	14.8	112	1.79	80	26.5	90	105	122	109	28.9	98	972	94	88.7	89	862	84
OKLAHOMA	12.9	98	2.57	115	33.1	112	114	107	112	37.0	126	1,311	127	72.6	73	952	92
OREGON	11.5	87	3.15	141	36.1	123	99	102	99	35.7	122	1,019	99	101.2	101	1,031	100
PENNSYLVANIA	14.4	110	1.34	60	19.3	66	101	103	102	19.7	67	931	90	104.8	105	975	95
RHODE ISLAND	13.5	102	1.95	87	26.2	89	98	103	99	25.9	88	827	80	129.9	130	1,075	104
SOUTH CAROLINA	13.0	98	2.13	95	27.6	94	109	105	108	29.8	101	774	75	95.3	95	737	72
SOUTH DAKOTA	16.1	122	1.98	89	31.8	108	89	115	94	29.9	101	888	86	92.9	93	825	80
TENNESSEE	12.2	92	2.10	94	25.6	87	109	107	109	27.9	95	813	79	87.0	87	707	69
TEXAS	12.1	92	2.56	115	31.0	106	109	102	107	33.2	113	1,360	132	64.6	65	878	85
UTAH	13.4	102	2.41	108	32.4	110	104	117	106	34.3	117	890	86	97.0	97	863	84
VERMONT	14.2	108	1.93	86	27.5	93	86	97	88	24.2	82	864	84	105.2	105	909	88
VIRGINIA	13.2	100	2.50	112	33.0	112	99	102	100	33.0	113	969	94	89.5	89	867	84
WASHINGTON	12.6	96	3.02	135	38.1	129	97	96	97	36.9	126	1,021	99	92.1	92	940	91
WEST VIRGINIA	12.5	95	2.22	99	27.8	94	99	113	102	28.3	96	926	90	83.1	83	770	75
WISCONSIN	15.8	120	2.42	108	38.1	129	103	107	104	39.6	135	936	91	120.3	120	1,125	109
WYOMING	12.8	97	2.45	110	31.5	107	80	104	86	27.1	92	2,226	216	72.5	73	1,614	157
UNITED STATES	13.2	100	2.23	100	29.4	100	100	100	100	29.4	100	1,029	100	100.0	100	1,029	100

Table 2 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1983 (continued)

	#6 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenues per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Process (#5x #6x #7)	
	Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
ALABAMA	14.6	140%	3,229	3,229	88%	1.28	102%	904	861	91%	4,092	89%	24,220	69%	16.9	128%
ALASKA	5.9	56	12,662	14,554	398	1.09	87	1140	1280	135	15,684	341	133,034	380	11.8	90
ARIZONA	13.6	130	3,097	3,037	83	1.30	103	929	911	96	3,948	86	21,041	60	18.8	143
ARKANSAS	12.3	117	3,594	3,209	88	1.25	99	898	840	88	4,047	88	33,472	96	12.1	92
CALIFORNIA	12.5	120	3,666	4,213	115	1.10	87	367	447	47	4,688	102	33,857	97	13.8	105
COLORADO	12.5	120	3,254	3,159	86	1.50	119	1627	1479	156	4,649	101	29,584	85	15.7	119
CONNECTICUT	6.8	65	3,756	3,756	103	1.21	96	789	805	85	4,590	100	54,365	155	8.4	64
DELAWARE	13.0	124	3,336	3,088	85	1.53	121	1768	1486	156	4,598	100	26,689	76	17.2	131
D.C.	5.8	55	7,348	7,987	219	1.05	83	367	375	39	8,208	178	92,703	265	8.9	67
FLORIDA	10.9	104	3,663	3,982	10	1.23	98	843	936	99	4,951	108	50,587	145	9.8	74
GEORGIA	11.8	113	4,582	4,323	118	1.21	96	962	899	95	5,231	114	37,562	107	13.9	106
HAWAII	13.9	134	5,376	5,543	152	1.11	88	591	569	60	6,028	131	30,982	89	19.5	148
IDAHO	12.8	123	3,646	4,191	115	1.17	93	620	590	62	4,688	102	35,943	103	13.0	99
ILLINOIS	8.5	81	3,224	3,192	87	1.23	98	741	772	81	3,965	86	36,061	103	11.0	84
INDIANA	10.8	103	3,318	3,016	83	1.36	108	1194	987	104	4,029	87	31,104	89	13.0	98
IOWA	12.1	116	4,287	3,862	106	1.29	102	1243	1100	116	4,982	108	32,394	93	15.4	117
KANSAS	14.7	140	3,800	3,304	90	1.22	97	836	781	82	4,103	89	26,361	75	15.6	118
KENTUCKY	13.3	127	4,041	3,742	102	1.24	98	970	851	90	4,598	100	31,510	90	14.6	111
LOUISIANA	12.1	116	4,022	3,559	97	1.19	94	764	714	75	4,273	93	38,675	111	11.0	84
MAINE	6.9	66	2,906	3,303	90	1.47	117	1366	1423	150	4,747	103	41,502	119	11.4	87
MARYLAND	10.2	98	3,681	3,257	89	1.38	110	1399	1442	152	4,618	100	30,549	87	15.1	115
MASSACHUSETTS	4.5	43	2,716	3,052	84	1.36	108	978	1052	111	4,105	89	49,783	142	8.2	63
MICHIGAN	8.6	82	2,914	2,914	80	1.52	121	1515	1457	153	4,385	95	28,886	83	15.2	115
MINNESOTA	9.2	88	3,350	2,965	81	1.30	103	1005	874	92	3,854	84	29,738	85	13.0	98
MISSISSIPPI	16.4	157	3,566	3,496	96	1.25	99	891	874	92	4,370	95	22,487	64	19.4	148
MISSOURI	9.3	89	2,824	2,881	79	1.28	102	791	753	79	3,651	79	37,884	108	9.6	73
MONTANA	11.4	109	3,580	3,978	109	1.22	97	788	780	82	4,697	102	36,640	105	12.8	97
NEBRASKA	13.9	133	3,852	2,963	81	1.26	100	1002	879	92	3,822	83	22,956	66	16.6	126
NEVADA	9.5	91	3,394	4,089	112	1.21	96	713	849	89	4,889	106	69,153	198	7.1	54
NEW HAMPSHIRE	5.2	50	1,663	1,957	54	2.21	175	2013	1663	175	3,953	86	46,698	133	8.5	64
NEW JERSEY	7.1	68	3,764	3,962	108	1.30	103	1129	1227	129	5,150	112	49,819	142	10.3	79
NEW MEXICO	14.1	135	4,644	4,222	116	1.19	94	882	741	78	4,934	107	33,125	95	14.9	113
NEW YORK	6.9	66	4,578	4,819	132	1.27	101	1236	1389	146	6,185	134	41,052	117	15.1	114
NORTH CAROLINA	17.2	165	4,321	4,646	127	1.14	90	605	611	64	5,240	114	28,041	80	18.7	142
NORTH DAKOTA	16.9	162	3,589	4,173	114	1.25	99	897	838	88	4,930	107	31,549	90	15.6	119
OHIO	8.2	78	2,666	2,539	69	1.54	122	1440	1180	124	3,766	82	33,648	96	11.2	85
OKLAHOMA	13.1	126	3,776	3,312	91	1.19	94	717	671	71	4,012	87	35,396	101	11.3	86
OREGON	11.2	107	3,194	3,226	88	1.34	106	1086	1065	112	4,323	94	28,514	81	15.2	115
PENNSYLVANIA	7.5	72	3,777	3,740	102	1.56	124	2115	2054	216	5,777	125	47,208	135	12.2	93
RHODE ISLAND	8.3	80	3,416	3,485	95	1.37	109	1264	1227	129	4,727	103	31,911	91	14.8	113
SOUTH CAROLINA	15.4	148	4,126	3,785	104	1.21	96	866	825	87	4,623	100	25,960	74	17.8	135
SOUTH DAKOTA	9.5	90	2,456	2,759	75	1.40	111	982	854	90	3,657	79	29,737	85	12.3	93
TENNESSEE	11.8	113	3,246	2,978	81	1.27	101	876	819	86	3,782	82	29,104	83	13.0	99
TEXAS	16.2	155	4,588	4,209	115	1.15	91	688	675	71	4,931	107	40,945	117	12.0	92
UTAH	15.0	144	3,996	3,843	105	1.26	100	1039	888	93	4,750	103	25,935	74	18.3	139
VERMONT	7.0	67	2,308	2,683	73	2.44	194	3323	3426	361	6,399	139	35,767	102	17.9	136
VIRGINIA	12.7	122	3,343	3,377	92	1.32	105	1070	1049	110	4,413	96	29,409	84	15.0	114
WASHINGTON	11.2	107	2,764	2,850	78	1.20	95	553	576	61	3,419	74	27,641	79	12.4	94
WEST VIRGINIA	12.1	116	3,351	3,385	93	1.16	92	536	474	50	3,811	83	32,689	93	11.7	89
WISCONSIN	11.4	109	3,364	3,266	89	1.34	106	1144	1069	113	4,335	94	23,624	68	18.3	139
WYOMING	14.3	137	7,354	9,192	251	1.12	89	882	848	89	9,577	208	82,204	235	11.7	89
UNITED STATES	10.4	100	3,655	3,655	100	1.26	100	950	950	100	4,605	100	34,991	100	13.2	100

TABLE 3

THE BASIC DATA

FY 1983/1981*

	A	B	C	D	E	Fa	Fb	F	Ga	Gt	G	H
	Resident Population July (000)	High School Graduates Spring	FTE Public Enrollment Fall	Tax Capacity FY (000,000)	Tax Revenues FY (000,000)	State Appro-priations (000,000)	Local Appro-priations (000,000)	State & Local Appro-priations (000,000)	System Cost Index Appn.	System Cost Index Tuit	System Cost Index FY	Tuition Factor FY
ALABAMA	3,917	48,794	122,761	3,003.0	2,720.0	392.4	4.0	396.4	1.00	1.05	1.01	1.28
ALASKA	412	5,518	11,728	1,373.0	2,533.0	148.5	.0	148.5	.87	.89	.88	1.09
ARIZONA	2,794	28,143	118,911	2,552.0	2,702.0	294.0	74.3	368.3	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.30
ARKANSAS	2,296	30,691	51,893	1,928.0	1,522.0	186.5	.0	186.5	1.12	1.07	1.11	1.25
CALIFORNIA	24,196	267,153	985,615	28,698.0	28,796.0	3,221.3	391.5	3,612.8	.87	.82	.86	1.10
COLORADO	2,965	37,729	110,808	3,442.0	2,877.0	350.4	10.2	360.6	1.03	1.10	1.05	1.50
CONNECTICUT	3,134	47,041	65,903	3,547.0	3,643.0	247.5	.0	247.5	1.00	.98	.99	1.21
DELAWARE	598	8,815	23,055	683.0	593.0	76.9	.0	76.9	1.08	1.19	1.11	1.53
D.C.	631	6,462	8,274	721.0	1,049.0	.0	60.8	60.8	.92	.98	.94	1.05
FLORIDA	10,183	99,124	230,176	10,596.0	7,762.0	843.2	.0	843.2	.92	.90	.91	1.23
GEORGIA	5,574	68,394	117,340	4,672.0	4,545.0	534.2	3.5	537.7	1.06	1.07	1.06	1.21
HAWAII	981	14,100	34,429	1,056.0	1,327.0	185.1	.0	185.1	.97	1.04	.99	1.11
IDAHO	959	12,993	26,110	854.0	743.0	91.8	3.4	95.2	.87	1.05	.91	1.17
ILLINOIS	11,462	157,600	340,115	12,265.0	12,883.0	925.8	170.7	1,096.5	1.01	.96	1.00	1.23
INDIANA	5,468	78,749	146,340	5,098.0	4,510.0	485.3	.2	485.5	1.10	1.21	1.12	1.36
IOWA	2,899	46,472	84,933	3,054.0	2,999.0	350.6	13.5	364.1	1.11	1.13	1.11	1.29
KANSAS	2,383	31,208	90,003	2,681.0	2,332.0	299.3	42.7	342.0	1.15	1.07	1.13	1.22
KENTUCKY	3,662	46,262	89,967	3,090.0	2,732.0	363.6	.0	363.6	1.08	1.14	1.09	1.24
LOUISIANA	4,308	56,072	119,379	5,171.0	3,968.0	480.1	.0	480.1	1.13	1.07	1.12	1.19
MAINE	1,133	17,444	24,738	924.0	1,046.0	71.9	.0	71.9	.88	.96	.90	1.47
MARYLAND	4,263	61,111	128,021	4,302.0	4,621.0	414.9	56.3	471.2	1.13	.97	1.10	1.38
MASSACHUSETTS	5,773	87,691	127,374	5,707.0	7,649.0	346.0	.0	346.0	.89	.93	.90	1.36
MICHIGAN	9,204	137,824	312,458	9,116.0	10,584.0	820.4	90.0	910.4	1.00	1.04	1.01	1.52
MINNESOTA	4,094	67,745	125,579	4,220.0	4,591.0	420.7	.0	420.7	1.13	1.15	1.13	1.30
MISSISSIPPI	2,531	31,805	81,356	1,866.0	1,766.0	275.8	14.3	290.1	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.25
MISSOURI	4,941	67,837	124,837	4,682.0	3,803.0	329.4	23.1	352.5	.98	1.05	.99	1.28
MONTANA	793	12,087	27,175	926.0	856.0	95.3	2.0	97.3	.90	1.01	.93	1.22
NEBRASKA	1,577	24,408	53,920	1,572.0	1,490.0	187.0	20.7	207.7	1.30	1.14	1.27	1.26
NEVADA	845	9,368	22,156	1,287.0	793.0	75.2	.0	75.2	.83	.84	.84	1.21
NEW HAMPSHIRE	936	13,703	21,161	919.0	679.0	35.2	.0	35.2	.85	1.21	.93	2.21
NEW JERSEY	7,404	107,701	168,611	7,980.0	8,913.0	568.3	66.3	634.6	.95	.92	.95	1.30
NEW MEXICO	1,328	18,865	41,860	1,553.0	1,383.0	184.1	10.3	194.4	1.10	1.19	1.12	1.19
NEW YORK	17,602	230,986	417,967	16,129.0	27,586.0	1,706.6	206.7	1,913.3	.95	.89	.94	1.27
NORTH CAROLINA	5,953	73,657	184,913	4,874.0	4,644.0	768.4	30.6	799.0	.93	.99	.94	1.14
NORTH DAKOTA	658	10,638	29,119	836.0	619.0	103.3	1.2	104.5	.86	1.07	.91	1.25
OHIO	10,781	159,272	285,690	10,478.0	9,292.0	736.6	25.0	761.6	1.05	1.22	1.09	1.54
OKLAHOMA	3,100	39,910	102,513	4,064.0	2,950.0	383.1	4.0	387.1	1.14	1.07	1.12	1.19
OREGON	2,651	30,400	95,719	2,702.0	2,734.0	240.6	65.1	305.7	.99	1.02	.99	1.34
PENNSYLVANIA	11,871	171,482	229,544	11,053.0	11,580.0	824.5	42.6	867.1	1.01	1.03	1.02	1.56
RHODE ISLAND	953	12,821	24,943	788.0	1,024.0	85.2	.0	85.2	.98	1.03	.99	1.37
SOUTH CAROLINA	3,167	41,031	87,420	2,451.0	2,335.0	352.6	8.1	360.7	1.09	1.05	1.08	1.21
SOUTH DAKOTA	686	11,024	21,787	609.0	566.0	53.5	.0	53.5	.89	1.15	.94	1.40
TENNESSEE	4,612	56,192	118,147	3,748.0	3,262.0	383.5	.0	383.5	1.09	1.07	1.09	1.27
TEXAS	14,766	178,919	458,358	20,081.0	12,969.0	2,016.5	86.4	2,102.9	1.09	1.02	1.07	1.15
UTAH	1,518	20,365	43,144	1,351.0	1,310.0	196.4	.0	196.4	1.04	1.17	1.06	1.26
VERMONT	516	7,345	14,170	446.0	469.0	32.5	.2	32.7	.86	.97	.88	2.44
VIRGINIA	5,430	71,657	178,926	5,262.0	4,709.0	598.2	.0	598.2	.99	1.02	1.00	1.32
WASHINGTON	4,217	53,143	160,936	4,304.0	3,962.0	443.7	.0	443.7	.97	.96	.97	1.20
WEST VIRGINIA	1,952	24,430	54,223	1,808.0	1,503.0	181.7	.0	181.7	.99	1.13	1.02	1.16
WISCONSIN	4,742	74,734	180,632	4,438.0	5,337.0	543.7	64.0	607.7	1.03	1.07	1.04	1.34
WYOMING	492	6,318	15,489	1,095.0	794.0	97.2	16.7	113.9	.80	1.04	.86	1.12
UNITED STATES	229,307	3,023,233	6,746,217	236,055.0	236,055.0	23,048.5	1,608.4	24,656.9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.26

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb), and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY'S 1978, 1980-83*

		#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
		High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
ALABAMA	78/76	13.2	93%	2.28	111%	30.2	104%	99	105	100	30.2	104%	554	77%	80.6	81%	446	62%
	80/78	12.7	92	2.47	121	31.3	111	99	105	100	31.3	111	627	76	82.0	82	514	62
	81/79	13.2	95	2.28	111	30.1	106	99	105	100	30.1	106	660	76	85.7	86	565	65
	82/80	12.6	94	2.44	114	30.8	106	100	105	101	31.1	107	719	76	85.2	85	612	65
	83/81	12.5	94	2.52	113	31.3	107	100	105	101	31.7	108	767	74	90.6	91	694	67
ALASKA	78/76	11.0	77%	2.01	98%	22.1	76%	85	83	84	18.5	64%	1,129	157%	94.4	94%	1,066	148%
	80/78	12.2	88	2.44	120	29.9	106	85	83	84	25.1	89	1,527	185	116.4	116	1,777	215
	81/79	13.1	95	2.02	99	26.5	93	85	83	84	22.3	78	1,884	217	129.0	129	2,430	280
	82/80	13.5	100	2.14	100	28.9	100	87	89	88	25.4	88	2,457	259	166.2	166	4,085	431
	83/81	13.4	102	2.13	95	28.5	97	87	89	88	25.1	85	3,333	324	184.5	184	6,148	597
ARIZONA	78/76	11.6	82%	4.10	200%	47.6	163%	103	103	103	49.0	168%	669	93%	105.7	106%	707	98%
	80/78	13.0	94	3.43	169	44.8	159	103	103	103	46.1	164	751	91	109.4	109	821	100
	81/79	12.0	86	3.66	179	43.9	155	103	103	103	45.3	159	788	91	114.6	115	903	104
	82/80	11.2	83	3.85	179	43.2	149	102	102	102	44.0	152	839	88	117.4	117	985	104
	83/81	10.1	76	4.23	189	42.6	145	102	102	102	43.4	148	913	89	105.9	106	967	94
ARKANSAS	78/76	12.8	90%	1.66	81%	21.3	73%	111	106	110	23.4	80%	568	79%	77.6	78%	441	61%
	80/78	12.8	93	1.62	80	20.8	74	111	106	110	22.9	81	644	78	80.2	80	516	63
	81/79	13.0	94	1.66	81	21.5	76	111	106	110	23.7	83	671	77	81.4	81	546	63
	82/80	13.1	98	1.74	81	22.9	79	112	107	111	25.4	88	747	79	85.5	86	639	67
	83/81	13.4	101	1.69	76	22.6	77	112	107	111	25.1	85	840	82	78.9	79	663	64
CALIFORNIA	78/76	13.3	94%	3.34	163%	44.4	152%	87	81	86	38.2	131%	810	113%	116.7	117%	946	132%
	80/78	12.4	89	3.16	156	39.1	139	87	81	86	33.6	119	950	115	116.2	116	1,104	134
	81/79	12.5	90	3.15	154	39.3	138	87	81	86	33.8	119	1,004	116	94.7	95	951	110
	82/80	11.9	88	3.27	152	38.8	134	87	82	86	33.4	115	1,108	117	101.8	102	1,127	119
	83/81	11.0	84	3.69	165	40.7	138	87	82	86	35.0	119	1,186	115	100.3	100	1,190	116
COLORADO	78/76	14.2	100%	2.91	142%	41.3	141%	105	103	106	43.7	150%	777	108%	92.0	92%	714	99%
	80/78	14.1	101	2.72	134	38.3	136	105	103	108	41.3	147	908	110	91.0	91	826	100
	81/79	13.8	99	2.73	133	37.7	133	105	103	106	40.0	141	955	110	96.2	96	918	106
	82/80	13.4	99	2.81	131	37.6	130	103	110	105	39.5	136	1,066	112	90.4	90	964	102
	83/81	12.7	97	2.94	132	37.4	127	103	110	105	39.2	133	1,161	113	83.6	84	970	94
CONNECTICUT	78/76	15.6	110%	1.33	65%	20.7	71%	97	96	97	20.1	69%	777	108%	101.1	101%	786	109%
	80/78	15.1	109	1.34	66	20.3	72	97	96	97	19.7	70	891	108	99.9	100	890	108
	81/79	15.1	109	1.35	66	20.4	72	97	96	97	19.8	70	940	108	102.3	102	961	111
	82/80	14.9	110	1.39	65	20.7	72	100	98	99	20.5	71	1,059	112	99.8	100	1,057	111
	83/81	15.0	114	1.40	63	21.0	71	100	98	99	20.8	71	1,132	110	102.7	103	1,162	113
DELAWARE	78/76	16.0	113%	2.24	109%	35.9	123%	111	123	114	40.9	140%	885	123%	85.2	85%	754	105%
	80/78	15.7	113	2.30	113	36.1	128	111	123	114	41.1	146	957	116	86.5	86	828	100
	81/79	15.8	114	2.34	114	36.9	130	111	123	114	42.1	148	949	109	95.5	95	906	105
	82/80	15.1	112	2.56	119	38.7	134	108	119	111	42.9	148	1,059	112	88.9	89	942	99
	83/81	14.7	112	2.62	117	38.6	131	108	119	111	42.8	145	1,142	111	86.8	87	992	96

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

Table 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1978, 1980-83* (continued)

		#6 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Actions (#5x #6x #7)	
		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
ALABAMA	78/76	16.9	164%	2,492	2,517	99%	1.27	100%	673	641	93%	3,165	98%	18,342	74%	17.3	132%
	80/78	16.2	153	2,657	2,684	86	1.27	101	717	683	85	3,375	86	20,024	68	16.9	126
	81/79	16.9	155	3,175	3,207	96	1.26	101	826	786	94	4,001	96	21,906	72	18.3	134
	82/80	15.7	144	3,130	3,130	88	1.27	102	845	805	90	3,935	88	23,128	71	17.0	125
	83/81	14.6	140	3,229	3,229	88	1.28	102	904	861	91	4,092	89	24,220	69	16.9	128
ALASKA	78/76	15.3	149%	7,395	8,700	343%	1.12	88%	887	1069	156%	9,861	306%	60,899	247%	16.2	124%
	80/78	10.2	96	6,046	7,113	229	1.09	87	544	656	81	7,845	201	60,775	208	12.9	97
	81/79	8.4	77	7,676	9,031	271	1.09	87	691	832	100	9,961	239	84,513	277	11.8	86
	82/80	7.4	68	10,523	12,095	339	1.09	87	947	1064	119	13,034	292	96,745	295	13.5	99
	83/81	5.9	56	12,662	14,554	398	1.09	87	1140	1280	135	15,684	341	133,034	380	11.8	90
ARIZONA	78/76	15.7	153%	2,337	2,269	89%	1.24	98%	561	545	79%	2,814	87%	13,657	55%	20.6	158%
	80/78	14.5	136	2,652	2,575	83	1.25	99	663	644	80	3,219	82	16,290	56	19.8	148
	81/79	14.4	132	2,964	2,877	86	1.28	102	830	806	97	3,683	88	17,400	57	21.2	155
	82/80	14.4	132	3,292	3,227	90	1.29	103	955	936	105	4,163	93	19,056	58	21.8	160
	83/81	13.6	130	3,097	3,037	83	1.30	103	929	911	96	3,948	86	21,041	60	18.8	143
ARKANSAS	78/76	13.2	128%	2,733	2,462	97%	1.27	100%	738	696	102%	3,155	98%	24,267	98%	13.0	99%
	80/78	13.5	127	3,356	3,023	97	1.21	96	705	665	82	3,691	94	28,155	96	13.1	98
	81/79	13.3	121	3,372	3,038	91	1.20	96	674	636	76	3,678	88	28,330	93	13.0	95
	82/80	11.9	109	3,306	2,952	83	1.22	98	727	680	76	3,634	81	29,376	90	12.4	91
	83/81	12.3	117	3,594	3,209	88	1.25	99	898	840	88	4,047	88	33,472	96	12.1	92
CALIFORNIA	78/76	12.9	125%	2,751	3,162	125%	1.10	87%	275	340	50%	3,519	109%	21,221	86%	16.6	127%
	80/78	12.0	113	3,376	3,881	125	1.09	87	304	375	46	4,279	109	28,238	96	15.2	113
	81/79	15.4	141	3,727	4,284	128	1.09	87	335	414	50	4,724	113	29,725	97	15.9	116
	82/80	13.8	127	4,024	4,625	129	1.10	88	402	491	55	5,146	115	33,198	101	15.5	114
	83/81	12.5	120	3,666	4,213	115	1.10	87	367	447	47	4,688	102	33,857	97	13.8	105
COLORADO	78/76	12.0	117%	2,078	1,979	78%	1.43	113%	893	867	127%	2,803	87%	17,766	72%	15.8	121%
	80/78	11.0	103	2,367	2,254	73	1.45	115	1065	1034	128	3,178	81	21,957	75	14.5	108
	81/79	10.9	100	2,657	2,530	76	1.46	117	1222	1187	142	3,659	88	23,883	78	15.3	112
	82/80	11.4	105	2,919	2,834	79	1.50	120	1459	1327	149	4,170	93	26,999	82	15.4	113
	83/81	12.5	120	3,254	3,159	86	1.50	119	1627	1479	156	4,649	101	29,584	85	15.7	119
CONNECTICUT	78/76	6.6	64%	2,504	2,581	102%	1.23	97%	576	600	88%	3,175	98%	38,679	157%	8.2	63%
	80/78	6.6	62	2,884	2,973	96	1.23	98	663	691	86	3,657	93	45,213	154	8.1	61
	81/79	7.0	64	3,314	3,417	102	1.22	98	729	759	91	4,168	100	47,459	156	8.8	64
	82/80	7.0	64	3,561	3,561	100	1.21	97	748	763	85	4,352	97	51,698	158	8.4	62
	83/81	6.8	63	3,756	3,756	103	1.21	96	789	805	85	4,590	100	54,365	155	8.4	64
DELAWARE	78/76	9.9	96%	2,077	1,871	74%	1.54	121%	1122	912	133%	2,806	87%	21,629	88%	13.0	99%
	80/78	10.8	102	2,470	2,225	72	1.62	129	1531	1245	154	3,509	90	23,264	79	15.1	113
	81/79	11.8	108	2,884	2,598	78	1.59	127	1701	1383	166	4,022	96	22,531	74	17.9	131
	82/80	12.8	118	3,129	2,898	81	1.59	127	1846	1552	174	4,463	100	24,681	75	18.2	133
	83/81	13.0	124	3,336	3,088	85	1.53	121	1768	1486	156	4,598	100	26,689	76	17.2	131

40

41

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY'S 1978, 1980-83*

		#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
		High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
D.C	78/76	9.3	65%	1.69	82%	15.7	54%	90	98	92	14.4	49%	834	116%	111.7	112%	932	130%
	80/78	9.5	69	1.25	62	11.9	42	90	98	92	11.0	39	941	114	126.5	127	1,190	144
	81/79	11.2	81	1.18	58	13.2	46	90	98	92	12.2	43	952	110	132.3	132	1,259	145
	82/80	10.3	76	1.23	57	12.6	44	92	98	94	11.9	41	1,056	111	131.2	131	1,386	146
	83/81	10.2	78	1.28	57	13.1	45	92	98	94	12.3	42	1,143	111	145.5	145	1,662	161
FLORIDA	78/76	11.0	77%	2.21	107%	24.3	83%	89	89	89	21.6	74%	748	104%	73.2	73%	548	76%
	80/78	10.7	77	2.24	110	23.9	85	89	89	89	21.3	75	842	102	73.4	73	618	75
	81/79	10.3	74	2.29	112	23.6	83	89	89	80	18.9	66	866	100	78.2	78	677	78
	82/80	9.9	73	2.39	111	23.6	82	92	90	91	21.5	74	947	100	73.8	74	700	74
	83/81	9.7	74	2.32	104	22.6	77	92	90	91	20.6	70	1,041	101	73.3	73	762	74
GEORGIA	78/76	12.6	89%	1.78	86%	22.5	77%	105	105	105	23.6	81%	611	85%	87.0	87%	532	74%
	80/78	12.2	88	1.77	87	21.6	77	105	105	105	22.7	80	685	83	89.4	89	612	74
	81/79	12.4	90	1.70	83	21.1	74	105	105	105	22.1	78	705	81	95.7	96	675	78
	82/80	12.2	90	1.67	78	20.4	71	106	107	106	21.6	75	778	82	96.2	96	748	79
	83/81	12.3	93	1.72	77	21.1	72	106	107	106	22.3	76	838	81	97.3	97	815	79
HAWAII	78/76	14.9	105%	2.64	128%	39.3	135%	100	106	101	39.7	136%	777	108%	118.3	118%	919	128%
	80/78	14.4	104	2.56	126	36.9	131	100	106	101	37.3	132	867	105	116.6	117	1,010	122
	81/79	14.8	107	2.40	117	35.6	125	100	106	101	35.9	126	891	103	127.6	128	1,137	131
	82/80	14.5	107	2.40	112	34.7	120	97	104	99	34.3	119	1,010	106	124.5	124	1,257	132
	83/81	14.4	109	2.44	109	35.1	119	97	104	99	34.7	118	1,076	105	125.7	126	1,353	131
IDAHO	78/76	14.2	100%	2.05	100%	28.9	99%	87	103	90	26.1	89%	633	88%	90.4	90%	572	80%
	80/78	14.8	107	1.76	87	26.1	92	87	103	90	23.4	83	734	89	88.9	89	653	79
	81/79	14.7	106	1.80	88	26.5	93	87	103	90	23.9	84	791	91	90.9	91	719	83
	82/80	14.3	106	1.97	92	28.1	97	87	105	91	25.5	88	830	87	88.3	88	733	77
	83/81	13.5	103	2.01	90	27.2	93	87	105	91	24.8	84	891	87	87.0	87	775	75
ILLINOIS	78/76	14.8	105%	1.93	94%	28.6	98%	102	94	101	28.9	99%	806	112%	94.4	94%	761	106%
	80/78	14.1	102	1.95	96	27.5	98	102	94	101	27.8	99	925	112	95.1	95	880	107
	81/79	14.2	102	1.89	92	26.8	94	102	94	101	27.1	95	969	112	98.9	99	958	111
	82/80	13.8	102	1.93	90	26.7	92	101	96	100	26.7	92	1,022	108	102.5	102	1,048	110
	83/81	13.7	104	2.16	97	29.7	101	101	96	100	29.7	101	1,070	104	105.0	105	1,124	109
INDIANA	78/76	15.3	108%	1.59	77%	24.2	83%	112	125	114	27.6	95%	705	98%	82.3	82%	580	81%
	80/78	14.2	102	1.64	81	23.3	83	112	125	114	26.5	94	817	99	82.6	83	675	82
	81/79	14.7	106	1.65	80	24.2	85	112	125	114	27.5	97	849	98	84.2	84	715	82
	82/80	14.3	106	1.82	85	26.0	90	110	121	112	29.2	101	877	92	84.2	84	739	78
	83/81	14.4	109	1.86	83	26.8	91	110	121	112	30.0	102	932	91	88.5	88	825	80
IOWA	78/76	15.8	111%	1.59	77%	25.2	86%	112	117	113	28.4	98%	748	104%	92.6	93%	692	96%
	80/78	16.4	119	1.57	77	25.8	92	112	117	113	29.2	104	875	106	88.5	88	774	94
	81/79	16.9	121	1.57	77	26.5	93	112	117	113	29.9	105	937	108	93.2	93	873	101
	82/80	16.4	122	1.74	81	28.4	98	111	113	111	31.6	109	1,000	105	95.7	96	958	101
	83/81	16.0	122	1.83	82	29.3	100	111	113	111	32.5	111	1,053	102	98.2	98	1,034	100

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

Table 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1978, 1980-83* (continued)

		#8 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Actions (#5x #6x #7)	
		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
D.C	78/76	5.6	55%	3,346	3,717	146%	1.05	83%	167	171	25%	3,818	118%	57,865	235%	6.6	50%
	80/78	6.0	57	6,036	6,707	216	1.07	85	423	431	53	7,021	179	85,799	293	8.2	61
	81/79	6.4	59	6,112	6,791	204	1.07	86	428	437	52	7,109	171	78,297	257	9.1	66
	82/80	6.0	55	6,581	7,154	200	1.06	85	395	403	45	7,422	166	88,879	271	8.4	61
	83/81	5.8	55	7,348	7,987	219	1.05	83	367	375	39	8,208	178	92,703	265	8.9	67
FLORIDA	78/76	10.2	99%	2,295	2,579	102%	1.28	101%	643	722	105%	3,301	102%	34,660	141%	9.5	73%
	80/78	10.9	103	2,827	3,177	102	1.27	101	763	858	106	4,034	103	39,563	135	10.2	76
	81/79	11.0	100	3,149	3,538	106	1.25	100	787	884	106	4,920	118	45,844	150	10.7	78
	82/80	11.6	106	3,434	3,732	104	1.23	98	790	878	98	4,641	104	44,160	135	10.5	77
	83/81	10.9	104	3,663	3,982	109	1.23	98	843	936	99	4,951	108	50,587	145	9.8	74
GEORGIA	78/76	11.2	109%	2,648	2,522	99%	1.29	102%	768	731	107%	3,254	101%	25,927	105%	12.5	96%
	80/78	12.0	113	3,398	3,236	104	1.24	98	815	777	96	4,013	103	30,196	103	13.3	99
	81/79	12.0	109	3,828	3,646	109	1.20	96	766	729	87	4,375	105	31,836	104	13.7	101
	82/80	12.3	113	4,492	4,238	119	1.20	96	898	840	94	5,086	114	35,956	110	14.1	104
	83/81	11.8	113	4,582	4,323	118	1.21	96	962	899	95	5,231	114	37,562	107	13.9	106
HAWAII	78/76	13.2	128%	3,088	3,088	122%	1.16	91%	494	466	68%	3,547	110%	19,550	79%	18.1	139%
	80/78	12.7	120	3,473	3,473	112	1.13	90	451	426	53	3,885	99	23,240	79	16.7	125
	81/79	12.5	115	4,008	4,008	120	1.12	90	481	454	54	4,444	107	24,802	81	17.9	131
	82/80	12.7	117	4,606	4,748	133	1.12	90	553	531	60	5,211	117	29,402	90	17.7	130
	83/81	13.9	124	5,376	5,543	152	1.11	88	591	569	60	6,028	131	30,982	89	19.5	148
IDAHO	78/76	15.9	154%	3,144	3,614	142%	1.14	90%	440	427	62%	3,982	124%	24,296	99%	16.4	125%
	80/78	14.3	135	3,577	4,112	132	1.12	89	429	417	52	4,452	114	31,327	107	14.2	106
	81/79	14.3	130	3,867	4,445	133	1.13	90	503	488	59	4,855	116	33,140	109	14.7	107
	82/80	13.9	128	3,643	4,187	117	1.16	93	583	555	62	4,643	104	32,507	99	14.3	105
	83/81	12.8	123	3,646	4,191	115	1.17	93	620	590	62	4,688	102	35,943	103	13.0	99
ILLINOIS	78/76	8.9	87%	2,381	2,334	92%	1.21	95%	500	532	78%	2,852	88%	27,902	113%	10.2	78%
	80/78	9.0	85	2,893	2,837	91	1.23	98	665	708	88	3,524	90	33,282	114	10.6	79
	81/79	9.3	85	3,321	3,256	98	1.22	98	731	777	93	4,012	96	35,799	117	11.2	82
	82/80	9.0	82	3,522	3,487	98	1.22	98	775	807	90	4,297	96	38,341	117	11.2	82
	83/81	8.5	81	3,224	3,192	87	1.23	98	741	772	81	3,965	86	36,061	103	11.0	84
INDIANA	78/76	11.3	110%	2,710	2,420	95%	1.35	106%	948	759	111%	3,209	100%	25,539	104%	12.6	96%
	80/78	11.2	106	3,245	2,897	93	1.35	107	1136	908	113	3,842	98	30,787	105	12.5	93
	81/79	11.7	107	3,475	3,103	93	1.34	107	1182	945	113	4,085	98	30,819	101	13.3	97
	82/80	11.9	109	3,377	3,070	86	1.35	108	1182	977	109	4,070	91	30,078	92	13.5	99
	83/81	10.8	103	3,318	3,016	83	1.36	108	1194	967	104	4,029	87	31,104	89	13.0	98
IOWA	78/76	11.2	108%	3,070	2,741	108%	1.30	102%	921	787	115%	3,531	110%	26,301	107%	13.4	103%
	80/78	12.3	116	3,674	3,280	106	1.28	102	1029	879	109	4,162	106	29,970	102	13.9	104
	81/79	11.5	105	3,791	3,384	101	1.27	102	1023	875	105	4,260	102	31,339	103	13.6	99
	82/80	11.4	105	3,855	3,473	97	1.28	102	1079	955	107	4,445	100	31,695	97	14.0	103
	83/81	12.1	116	4,287	3,862	106	1.29	102	1243	1100	116	4,982	108	32,394	93	15.4	117

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY'S 1978, 1980-83*

		#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
		High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
KANSAS	78/76	14.8	104%	2.48	120%	36.5	125%	113	107	112	40.9	140%	763	106%	85.8	86%	654	91%
	80/78	14.8	107	2.48	122	36.7	130	113	107	112	41.1	146	875	106	85.5	85	747	91
	81/79	14.5	105	2.56	125	37.2	131	113	107	112	41.6	146	948	109	87.1	87	825	95
	82/80	13.8	103	2.72	127	37.7	130	115	107	113	42.6	147	1,033	109	87.9	88	908	96
	83/81	13.1	99	2.88	129	37.8	128	115	107	113	42.7	145	1,125	109	87.0	87	979	95
KENTUCKY	78/76	12.7	89%	1.90	92%	24.1	82%	108	116	109	26.2	90%	611	85%	87.1	87%	533	74%
	80/78	12.4	90	1.86	91	23.2	82	108	116	109	25.2	90	693	84	82.6	83	573	69
	81/79	12.4	89	1.88	92	23.4	82	108	116	109	25.5	90	736	85	86.7	87	638	74
	82/80	12.4	92	1.97	92	24.4	84	108	114	109	26.6	92	789	83	88.6	89	699	74
	83/81	12.6	96	1.94	87	24.6	84	108	114	109	26.8	91	844	82	88.4	88	746	72
LOUSIANA	78/76	13.7	96%	2.04	99%	27.9	96%	111	106	110	30.7	105%	741	103%	80.0	80%	593	82%
	80/78	13.3	96	1.97	97	26.1	93	111	106	110	28.8	102	850	103	77.2	77	655	80
	81/79	13.4	97	1.93	94	25.9	91	111	106	110	28.5	100	897	103	82.2	82	737	85
	82/80	13.2	98	2.01	93	26.4	91	113	107	112	29.6	102	1,035	109	77.7	78	804	85
	83/81	13.0	99	2.13	95	27.7	94	113	107	112	31.0	105	1,200	117	76.7	77	921	89
MAINE	78/76	15.1	106%	1.43	69%	21.5	74%	91	117	96	20.7	71%	597	83%	110.4	110%	659	92%
	80/78	14.9	107	1.36	67	20.2	72	91	117	96	19.4	69	668	81	108.5	108	725	88
	81/79	15.3	110	1.37	67	21.0	74	91	117	96	20.1	71	694	80	109.6	110	761	88
	82/80	15.4	114	1.41	66	21.7	75	88	96	90	19.5	67	761	80	111.1	111	845	89
	83/81	15.4	117	1.42	64	21.8	74	88	96	90	19.7	67	816	79	113.2	113	923	90
MARYLAND	78/76	14.7	104%	2.01	98%	29.7	102%	113	95	109	32.4	111%	719	100%	112.4	112%	809	112%
	80/78	14.8	107	1.95	96	29.0	103	113	95	109	31.6	112	825	100	106.1	106	876	106
	81/79	14.7	106	2.01	98	29.6	104	113	5	100	29.6	104	857	99	109.3	109	936	108
	82/80	14.5	108	2.06	96	29.8	103	113	97	110	32.8	113	941	99	108.6	109	1,023	108
	83/81	14.3	109	2.09	94	30.0	102	113	97	110	33.0	112	1,009	98	107.4	107	1,084	105
MASSACHUSETTS	78/76	15.6	110%	1.39	67%	21.6	74%	91	94	91	19.7	67%	669	93%	136.3	136%	912	127%
	80/78	15.9	115	1.33	65	21.2	75	91	94	91	19.3	68	767	93	142.4	142	1,093	132
	81/79	15.5	112	1.38	67	21.4	75	91	94	91	19.5	69	810	93	144.4	144	1,170	135
	82/80	15.1	112	1.48	69	22.3	77	89	93	90	20.1	69	914	96	134.5	135	1,229	130
	83/81	15.2	115	1.45	65	22.1	75	89	93	90	19.9	67	989	96	134.0	134	1,325	129
MICHIGAN	78/76	15.4	108%	2.10	102%	32.2	110%	102	108	103	33.2	114%	734	102%	101.9	102%	748	104%
	80/78	15.6	112	2.05	101	31.9	113	102	108	103	32.9	117	850	103	110.1	110	935	113
	81/79	15.6	112	2.10	102	32.7	115	102	108	103	33.7	118	902	104	113.2	113	1,021	118
	82/80	14.9	111	2.26	105	33.7	117	100	104	101	34.0	118	922	97	115.6	116	1,066	112
	83/81	15.0	114	2.27	102	33.9	115	100	104	101	34.3	117	990	96	116.1	116	1,150	112
MINNESOTA	78/76	17.8	125%	1.61	79%	28.7	98%	114	118	115	33.0	113%	698	97%	118.1	118%	824	115%
	80/78	17.8	128	1.59	78	28.3	100	114	118	115	32.5	115	833	101	114.9	115	958	116
	81/79	17.5	126	1.63	80	28.6	101	114	118	115	32.9	116	913	105	115.4	115	1,053	122
	82/80	17.0	126	1.75	82	29.8	103	113	115	113	33.7	116	970	102	111.1	111	1,078	114
	83/81	16.5	126	1.85	83	30.7	104	113	115	113	34.7	118	1,031	100	108.8	109	1,121	109

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

Table 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1978, 1980-83* (continued)

		#6 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Actions (#5x #6x #7)	
		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
KANSAS	78/76	14.1	137%	2,518	2,229	88%	1.27	100%	680	635	93%	2,856	89%	18,628	76%	15.3	117%
	80/78	15.7	148	3,200	2,832	91	1.25	100	832	778	96	3,601	92	21,276	73	16.9	127
	81/79	15.8	145	3,518	3,113	93	1.23	98	809	756	91	3,864	93	22,773	75	17.0	124
	82/80	15.0	138	3,627	3,154	88	1.24	99	870	813	91	3,980	89	24,257	74	16.4	121
	83/81	14.7	140	3,800	3,304	90	1.22	97	836	781	82	4,103	89	26,361	75	15.6	118
KENTUCKY	78/76	11.6	112%	2,559	2,370	93%	1.31	103%	793	684	100%	3,076	95%	23,311	95%	13.2	101%
	80/78	14.5	137	3,586	3,321	107	1.27	101	968	835	103	4,175	107	27,462	94	15.2	114
	81/79	13.2	121	3,611	3,343	100	1.23	98	830	716	86	4,074	98	28,873	95	14.1	103
	82/80	13.9	127	3,975	3,681	103	1.21	97	835	732	82	4,413	99	29,654	90	14.9	109
	83/81	13.3	127	4,041	3,742	102	1.24	98	970	851	90	4,598	100	31,510	90	14.6	111
LOUSIANA	78/76	10.3	100%	2,185	1,968	78%	1.22	96%	481	453	66%	2,423	75%	24,145	98%	10.0	77%
	80/78	12.3	116	3,080	2,775	89	1.24	98	739	697	86	3,472	89	29,555	101	11.7	88
	81/79	13.0	119	3,690	3,324	100	1.22	98	812	766	92	4,092	98	31,463	103	13.0	95
	82/80	13.3	122	4,051	3,585	100	1.20	96	810	757	85	4,340	97	34,978	107	12.4	91
	83/81	12.1	116	4,022	3,559	97	1.19	94	764	714	75	4,273	93	38,675	111	11.0	84
MAINE	78/76	6.2	60%	1,895	2,083	82%	1.37	108%	701	599	87%	2,705	84%	28,871	117%	9.4	72%
	80/78	6.9	65	2,484	2,730	88	1.49	118	1217	1040	129	3,856	99	34,440	118	11.2	84
	81/79	7.2	66	2,602	2,860	86	1.46	117	1197	1023	123	3,958	95	34,496	113	11.5	84
	82/80	6.9	63	2,690	3,056	86	1.45	116	1210	1261	141	4,333	97	39,017	119	11.1	82
	83/81	6.9	66	2,906	3,303	90	1.47	117	1366	1423	150	4,747	103	41,502	119	11.4	87
MARYLAND	78/76	8.7	85%	2,372	2,099	83%	1.40	110%	949	999	146%	3,046	94%	22,227	90%	13.7	105%
	80/78	9.7	92	2,934	2,597	84	1.42	113	1232	1297	161	3,823	98	26,108	89	14.6	110
	81/79	10.3	94	3,253	2,878	86	1.38	110	1236	4720	566	4,489	108	28,976	95	15.5	113
	82/80	9.9	90	3,377	2,989	84	1.38	110	1283	1323	148	4,237	95	28,679	87	14.8	109
	83/81	10.2	98	3,681	3,257	89	1.38	110	1398	1442	152	4,618	100	30,549	87	15.1	115
MASSACHUSETTS	78/76	4.3	42%	1,816	1,996	79%	1.22	96%	399	425	62%	2,435	76%	33,975	138%	7.2	55%
	80/78	4.5	42	2,316	2,545	82	1.22	97	510	542	67	3,105	79	39,793	136	7.8	58
	81/79	4.1	38	2,244	2,466	74	1.21	97	471	501	60	2,984	72	41,591	136	7.2	52
	82/80	4.4	41	2,444	2,746	77	1.22	98	538	578	65	3,313	74	45,463	139	7.3	54
	83/81	4.5	43	2,716	3,052	84	1.36	108	878	1052	111	4,105	89	49,783	142	8.2	63
MICHIGAN	78/76	9.8	96%	2,298	2,253	89%	1.44	113%	1011	936	137%	3,213	100%	22,103	90%	14.5	111%
	80/78	9.7	91	2,831	2,775	89	1.43	113	1217	1127	140	3,930	100	23,843	88	15.2	114
	81/79	8.2	75	2,575	2,525	76	1.41	113	1056	978	117	3,525	85	26,777	88	13.2	96
	82/80	8.4	77	2,653	2,653	74	1.42	114	1114	1071	120	3,730	84	27,103	83	13.8	101
	83/81	8.6	82	2,914	2,914	80	1.52	121	1515	1457	153	4,385	95	28,886	83	15.2	115
MINNESOTA	78/76	9.2	89%	2,628	2,306	91%	1.28	101%	736	624	91%	2,926	91%	21,142	86%	13.8	106%
	80/78	9.4	89	3,195	2,803	90	1.27	101	863	731	91	3,528	90	25,611	87	13.8	103
	81/79	8.7	80	3,209	2,815	84	1.26	101	834	707	85	3,516	84	27,750	91	12.7	93
	82/80	9.0	85	3,268	2,892	81	1.27	102	882	767	86	3,673	82	28,828	88	12.7	94
	83/81	9.2	88	3,350	2,965	81	1.30	103	1005	874	92	3,854	84	29,738	85	13.0	98

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY'S 1978, 1980-83*

		#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
		High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
MISSISSIPPI	78/76	12.1	85%	2.56	125%	30.9	106%	101	100	101	31.2	107%	511	71%	92.2	92%	471	65%
	80/78	11.8	85	2.52	124	29.7	106	101	100	101	30.0	107	578	70	93.6	94	541	66
	81/79	12.6	91	2.41	118	30.5	107	101	100	101	30.8	108	607	70	96.5	97	586	68
	82/80	12.4	92	2.45	114	30.3	105	102	102	102	30.9	107	659	69	96.5	96	636	67
	83/81	12.6	95	2.56	115	32.1	109	102	102	102	32.8	111	737	72	94.6	95	698	68
MISSOURI	78/76	14.7	104%	1.66	81%	24.4	84%	97	104	99	24.2	83%	683	95%	82.6	83%	565	79%
	80/78	14.6	105	1.64	80	23.9	85	97	104	99	23.6	84	784	95	79.5	80	624	76
	81/79	14.7	106	1.59	78	23.4	82	97	104	99	23.1	81	842	97	82.1	82	691	80
	82/80	14.2	105	1.74	81	24.6	85	98	105	99	24.4	84	889	94	83.6	84	743	78
	83/81	13.7	104	1.84	82	25.3	86	98	105	99	25.0	85	948	92	81.2	81	770	75
MONTANA	78/76	16.5	116%	1.90	93%	31.4	108%	89	110	93	29.2	100%	741	103%	94.9	95%	703	98%
	80/78	15.9	115	1.92	94	30.4	108	89	110	93	28.3	100	891	108	87.9	88	784	95
	81/79	16.0	115	1.97	96	31.4	111	89	110	93	29.2	103	982	113	87.5	88	859	99
	82/80	16.0	119	2.08	97	33.4	115	90	101	93	31.0	107	1,068	113	92.2	92	984	104
	83/81	15.2	116	2.25	101	34.3	116	90	101	93	31.9	108	1,168	113	92.4	92	1,079	105
NEBRASKA	78/76	16.0	113%	1.97	96%	31.6	108%	122	110	120	37.9	130%	727	101%	90.7	91%	659	92%
	80/78	16.5	119	1.92	94	31.6	112	122	110	120	37.9	135	817	99	93.4	93	763	93
	81/79	16.4	118	2.00	98	32.7	115	122	110	120	39.2	138	863	100	97.6	98	843	97
	82/80	16.0	119	2.12	99	33.9	117	130	114	127	43.0	149	920	97	102.2	102	940	99
	83/81	15.5	117	2.21	99	34.2	116	130	114	127	43.4	148	897	97	94.8	95	945	92
NEVADA	78/76	11.8	83%	2.28	111%	27.0	93%	81	81	81	21.9	75%	1,093	152%	70.7	71%	773	108%
	80/78	11.9	86	2.10	103	25.1	89	81	81	81	20.3	72	1,271	154	60.9	61	773	94
	81/79	11.3	81	2.32	113	26.2	92	81	81	81	21.2	75	1,330	154	65.2	65	867	100
	82/80	10.9	81	2.38	111	25.9	90	83	84	84	21.7	75	1,454	153	59.5	60	865	91
	83/81	11.1	84	2.37	106	26.2	89	83	84	84	22.0	75	1,523	148	61.6	62	938	91
NEW HAMPSHIRE	78/76	15.1	106%	1.53	74%	23.1	79%	90	117	95	21.9	75%	734	102%	75.6	76%	555	77%
	80/78	14.3	103	1.52	75	21.7	77	90	117	95	20.7	73	817	99	74.3	74	607	74
	81/79	15.6	113	1.39	68	21.7	77	90	117	95	20.7	73	835	96	78.3	78	654	75
	82/80	15.2	113	1.45	67	21.9	76	85	121	93	20.4	70	915	96	75.0	75	687	72
	83/81	14.6	111	1.54	69	22.6	77	85	121	93	21.0	71	982	95	73.9	74	725	70
NEW JERSEY	78/76	15.3	107%	1.39	67%	21.2	73%	95	93	95	20.1	69%	755	105%	104.9	105%	792	110%
	80/78	15.0	108	1.46	72	22.0	78	95	93	95	20.8	74	850	103	114.4	114	972	118
	81/79	15.3	110	1.47	72	22.4	79	95	93	95	21.3	75	886	102	117.7	118	1,043	120
	82/80	14.8	110	1.54	72	22.8	79	95	92	95	21.7	75	998	105	112.0	112	1,118	118
	83/81	14.5	110	1.57	70	22.8	77	95	92	95	21.6	74	1,078	105	111.7	112	1,204	117
NEW MEXICO	78/76	15.6	110%	2.10	102%	32.6	112%	110	121	112	36.5	125%	705	98%	82.9	83%	585	81%
	80/78	15.2	110	2.03	100	30.9	110	110	121	112	34.6	123	842	102	83.0	83	699	85
	81/79	15.4	111	1.99	97	30.6	108	110	121	112	34.3	121	894	103	85.0	85	760	88
	82/80	14.8	110	2.11	98	31.3	108	110	119	112	35.1	121	1,015	107	83.1	83	843	89
	83/81	14.2	108	2.22	99	31.5	107	110	119	112	35.3	120	1,169	114	89.1	89	1,041	101

50

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

51

Table 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1978, 1980-83* (continued)

		#5 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Actions (#5x #6x #7)	
		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
MISSISSIPPI	78/76	16.0	155%	2,437	2,413	95%	1.27	100%	658	658	96%	3,064	95%	16,356	66%	18.7	143%
	80/78	17.0	160	3,093	3,062	99	1.26	100	804	804	100	3,859	99	19,228	66	20.1	150
	81/79	17.4	159	3,340	3,307	99	1.24	99	802	802	96	4,101	98	19,715	65	20.8	152
	82/80	17.2	158	3,603	3,533	99	1.25	100	901	883	99	4,416	99	21,346	65	20.7	152
	83/81	16.4	157	3,566	3,496	96	1.25	99	891	874	92	4,370	95	22,487	64	19.4	148
MISSOURI	78/76	9.6	93%	2,213	2,282	90%	1.31	103%	686	660	96%	2,929	91%	28,261	115%	10.4	79%
	80/78	10.4	95	2,716	2,800	90	1.28	102	760	731	91	3,521	90	33,149	113	10.6	79
	81/79	10.3	94	3,052	3,146	94	1.27	102	824	792	95	3,915	94	36,442	120	10.7	79
	82/80	9.0	83	2,716	2,771	78	1.27	102	733	698	78	3,484	78	36,459	111	9.6	70
	83/81	9.3	89	2,824	2,881	79	1.28	102	791	753	79	3,651	79	37,884	108	9.6	73
MONTANA	78/76	10.0	97%	2,239	2,516	99%	1.27	100%	605	550	80%	3,058	95%	25,404	103%	12.0	92%
	80/78	10.0	95	2,583	2,903	93	1.25	99	646	587	73	3,472	89	31,506	108	11.0	83
	81/79	10.0	91	2,722	3,058	92	1.24	99	653	594	71	3,629	87	33,596	110	10.8	79
	82/80	11.0	101	3,257	3,619	101	1.23	98	748	742	83	4,308	96	34,428	105	12.5	92
	83/81	11.4	109	3,580	3,978	109	1.22	97	788	780	82	4,697	102	36,640	105	12.8	97
NEBRASKA	78/76	14.1	136%	2,936	2,406	95%	1.28	101%	822	747	109%	3,132	97%	19,187	78%	16.3	125%
	80/78	13.9	131	3,364	2,758	89	1.25	99	841	765	95	3,505	90	21,540	74	16.3	122
	81/79	14.0	128	3,605	2,955	89	1.25	100	901	819	98	3,755	90	21,994	72	17.1	125
	82/80	13.6	125	3,779	2,907	81	1.26	101	983	862	97	3,749	84	21,367	65	17.5	129
	83/81	13.9	133	3,852	2,963	81	1.26	100	1002	879	92	3,822	83	22,956	66	16.6	126
NEVADA	78/76	9.1	88%	2,606	3,217	127%	1.23	97%	599	740	108%	3,957	123%	50,022	203%	7.9	61%
	80/78	10.2	97	3,157	3,897	126	1.24	98	758	935	116	4,832	124	62,578	214	7.7	58
	81/79	9.4	86	3,096	3,822	115	1.22	98	681	841	101	4,663	112	62,645	205	7.4	54
	82/80	9.4	87	3,154	3,800	106	1.21	97	662	788	88	4,543	102	66,865	204	6.8	50
	83/81	9.5	91	3,394	4,089	112	1.21	96	713	849	89	4,889	106	69,153	198	7.1	54
NEW HAMPSHIRE	78/76	5.9	57%	1,405	1,561	62%	2.12	167%	1574	1345	196%	3,136	97%	33,431	136%	9.4	72%
	80/78	5.5	52	1,533	1,704	55	2.10	167	1687	1442	179	3,390	87	39,562	135	8.6	64
	81/79	5.5	50	1,659	1,843	55	2.16	173	1924	1645	197	3,772	90	40,398	133	9.3	68
	82/80	6.2	57	1,943	2,285	64	2.13	170	2195	1814	203	4,449	100	44,914	137	9.9	73
	83/81	5.2	50	1,663	1,957	54	2.21	175	2013	1663	175	3,953	86	46,698	133	8.5	64
NEW JERSEY	78/76	7.6	74%	2,853	3,003	118%	1.31	103%	884	951	139%	3,934	122%	37,579	152%	10.5	80%
	80/78	7.2	68	3,190	3,358	108	1.30	103	957	1029	127	4,365	112	40,709	139	10.7	80
	81/79	7.2	66	3,356	3,532	106	1.29	103	973	1046	126	4,557	109	41,688	137	10.9	80
	82/80	7.4	68	3,653	3,846	108	1.29	103	1059	1152	129	4,961	111	46,104	141	10.8	79
	83/81	7.1	68	3,764	3,962	108	1.30	103	1129	1227	129	5,150	112	49,819	142	10.3	79
NEW MEXICO	78/76	14.6	142%	2,621	2,383	94%	1.28	101%	734	607	89%	2,996	93%	19,293	78%	15.5	119%
	80/78	14.7	139	3,329	3,027	98	1.21	96	699	578	72	3,597	92	24,341	83	14.8	111
	81/79	15.4	141	3,822	3,475	104	1.20	96	764	632	76	4,095	98	26,097	86	15.7	115
	82/80	16.1	148	4,336	3,941	110	1.21	97	910	765	86	4,684	105	28,942	88	16.2	119
	83/81	14.1	135	4,644	4,222	116	1.19	94	882	741	78	4,934	107	33,125	95	14.9	113

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY'S 1978, 1980-83*

		#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
		High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
NEW YORK	78/76	13.5	95%	1.71	83%	23.1	79%	96	89	94	21.7	74%	676	94%	169.6	170%	1,147	159%
	80/78	13.6	98	1.68	83	22.8	81	96	89	94	21.4	76	752	91	167.9	168	1,262	153
	81/79	13.8	100	1.67	82	23.2	81	96	89	94	21.8	77	772	89	171.0	171	1,320	152
	82/80	13.5	101	1.74	81	23.5	81	95	89	94	22.1	77	857	90	167.4	167	1,434	151
	83/81	13.1	100	1.81	81	23.7	81	95	89	94	22.3	76	916	89	171.0	171	1,567	152
NORTH CAROLINA	78/76	13.1	93%	2.21	107%	29.0	99%	94	99	95	27.5	94%	597	83%	86.4	86%	516	72%
	80/78	12.9	93	2.25	111	29.1	103	94	99	95	27.7	98	677	82	86.5	86	585	71
	81/79	12.7	92	2.30	112	29.3	103	94	99	95	27.8	98	708	82	90.9	91	644	74
	82/80	12.8	95	2.38	111	30.4	105	93	99	94	28.6	99	754	80	96.9	97	731	77
	83/81	12.4	94	2.51	113	31.1	106	93	99	94	29.2	99	819	80	95.3	95	780	76
NORTH DAKOTA	78/76	18.5	131%	2.12	103%	39.3	135%	86	104	90	35.3	121%	705	98%	94.3	94%	665	92%
	80/78	17.3	125	2.43	120	42.2	150	86	104	90	38.0	135	842	102	82.2	82	692	84
	81/79	17.1	123	2.41	118	41.1	145	86	104	90	37.0	130	941	109	77.7	78	731	84
	82/80	16.3	121	2.64	123	43.0	149	86	107	91	39.1	135	1,028	108	78.8	79	809	85
	83/81	16.2	123	2.74	123	44.3	150	86	107	91	40.3	137	1,271	123	74.0	74	941	91
OHIO	78/76	16.1	113%	1.52	74%	24.4	84%	106	120	109	26.6	91%	734	102%	79.4	79%	582	81%
	80/78	15.5	112	1.54	76	23.9	85	106	120	109	26.1	93	843	102	81.5	82	687	83
	81/79	15.5	112	1.59	78	24.6	87	106	120	109	26.9	95	873	101	86.2	86	752	87
	82/80	14.8	110	1.73	81	25.7	89	105	122	109	28.0	97	920	97	86.7	87	798	84
	83/81	14.8	112	1.79	80	26.5	90	105	122	109	28.9	98	972	94	88.7	89	862	84
OKLAHOMA	78/76	13.6	96%	2.57	125%	35.0	120%	113	106	112	39.2	134%	748	104%	69.4	69%	519	72%
	80/78	13.6	98	2.45	121	33.4	118	113	106	112	37.4	133	875	106	70.5	70	617	75
	81/79	13.5	98	2.46	120	33.4	117	113	106	112	37.4	131	937	108	74.0	74	693	80
	82/80	13.3	99	2.54	118	33.7	116	114	107	112	37.7	130	1,106	117	71.5	72	791	83
	83/81	12.9	98	2.57	115	33.1	112	114	107	112	37.0	126	1,311	127	72.6	73	952	92
OREGON	78/76	13.6	96%	2.91	141%	39.6	136%	100	99	100	39.6	136%	734	102%	94.1	94%	691	96%
	80/78	12.7	91	2.84	140	36.0	128	100	99	100	36.0	128	866	105	89.3	89	774	94
	81/79	12.3	89	2.99	146	36.7	129	100	99	100	36.7	129	922	106	92.6	93	854	99
	82/80	12.0	89	3.10	144	37.0	128	99	102	99	36.7	127	979	103	93.3	93	914	96
	83/81	11.5	87	3.15	141	36.1	123	99	102	99	35.7	122	1,019	99	101.2	101	1,031	100
PENNSYLVANIA	78/76	15.9	112%	1.19	58%	19.0	65%	101	105	102	19.3	66%	698	97%	97.8	98%	682	95%
	80/78	15.3	110	1.21	60	18.5	66	101	105	102	18.9	67	793	96	100.5	101	797	97
	81/79	15.5	112	1.19	58	18.5	65	101	105	102	18.9	66	806	93	105.4	105	850	98
	82/80	14.7	109	1.30	61	19.1	66	98	103	99	18.9	65	880	93	103.8	104	913	96
	83/81	14.4	110	1.34	60	19.3	66	101	103	102	19.7	67	931	90	104.8	105	975	95
RHODE ISLAND	78/76	13.3	94%	1.77	86%	23.5	81%	99	105	100	23.5	81%	626	87%	110.8	111%	693	96%
	80/78	13.2	95	1.86	91	24.6	87	99	105	100	24.6	87	701	85	109.9	110	771	93
	81/79	13.6	98	1.85	90	25.1	88	99	105	100	25.1	88	727	84	121.0	121	880	102
	82/80	13.5	100	1.93	90	26.0	90	98	103	99	25.7	89	796	84	123.1	123	980	103
	83/81	13.5	102	1.95	87	26.2	89	98	103	99	25.9	88	827	80	129.9	130	1,075	104

54

55

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

Table 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1978, 1980-83* (continued)

		#6 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Actions (#5x #6x #7)	
		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
NEW YORK	78/76	6.1	59%	3,008	3,134	123%	1.19	94%	572	642	94%	3,808	118%	31,150	126%	12.2	94%
	80/78	6.8	64	3,781	3,939	127	1.31	104	1172	1317	163	5,269	135	35,038	120	15.0	113
	81/79	7.0	64	4,011	4,178	125	1.27	102	1083	1217	146	5,419	130	35,468	116	15.3	112
	82/80	7.1	65	4,340	4,569	128	1.27	102	1172	1317	147	5,864	131	38,719	118	15.1	111
	83/81	6.9	66	4,578	4,819	132	1.27	101	1236	1389	146	6,185	134	41,052	117	15.1	114
NORTH CAROLINA	78/76	16.2	157%	2,873	3,057	120%	1.18	93%	517	522	76%	3,569	111%	21,685	88%	16.5	126%
	80/78	17.4	164	3,498	3,721	120	1.17	93	595	601	74	4,308	110	24,456	84	17.6	132
	81/79	17.8	163	3,921	4,171	125	1.16	93	627	634	76	4,787	115	25,487	84	18.8	137
	82/80	17.3	159	4,156	4,468	125	1.14	91	582	588	66	5,040	113	26,367	80	19.1	140
	83/81	17.2	165	4,321	4,646	127	1.14	90	605	611	64	5,240	114	28,041	80	18.7	142
NORTH DAKOTA	78/76	14.4	140%	2,436	2,833	112%	1.25	98%	609	586	85%	3,384	105%	19,948	81%	17.0	130%
	80/78	16.5	156	2,706	3,147	101	1.23	98	622	598	74	3,698	95	22,176	76	16.7	125
	81/79	16.5	151	2,926	3,403	102	1.21	97	614	591	71	3,934	94	25,410	83	15.5	113
	82/80	19.6	180	3,701	4,304	120	1.24	99	888	830	93	5,043	113	26,284	80	19.2	141
	83/81	16.9	162	3,589	4,173	114	1.25	99	897	838	88	4,930	107	31,549	90	15.6	119
OHIO	78/76	8.8	86%	2,103	1,984	78%	1.54	121%	1136	947	138%	2,972	92%	27,546	112%	10.8	83%
	80/78	9.0	85	2,594	2,448	79	1.50	119	1297	1081	134	3,570	91	32,291	110	11.1	83
	81/79	8.9	81	2,708	2,555	77	1.50	120	1354	1128	135	3,726	89	32,485	107	11.5	84
	82/80	8.6	79	2,668	2,541	71	1.49	119	1308	1072	120	3,648	82	32,854	100	11.1	82
	83/81	8.2	78	2,666	2,539	69	1.54	122	1440	1180	124	3,768	82	33,648	96	11.2	85
OKLAHOMA	78/76	12.1	117%	1,789	1,583	62%	1.28	101%	501	473	69%	2,044	63%	19,090	77%	10.7	82%
	80/78	12.9	122	2,385	2,111	68	1.26	100	620	585	72	2,684	69	23,403	80	11.5	86
	81/79	13.3	122	2,768	2,450	73	1.22	98	609	575	69	3,015	72	25,070	82	12.0	88
	82/80	13.7	126	3,219	2,824	79	1.20	96	644	602	67	3,449	77	29,324	89	11.8	86
	83/81	13.1	126	3,776	3,312	91	1.19	94	717	671	71	4,012	87	35,396	101	11.3	86
OREGON	78/76	13.7	133%	2,388	2,388	94%	1.29	102%	692	699	102%	3,080	96%	18,535	75%	16.6	127%
	80/78	14.0	132	3,008	3,008	97	1.28	102	842	851	105	3,850	98	24,051	82	16.0	120
	81/79	12.4	113	2,874	2,874	86	1.29	103	833	842	101	3,707	89	25,112	82	14.8	108
	82/80	12.8	118	3,166	3,198	90	1.30	104	950	931	104	4,157	93	26,698	81	15.6	114
	83/81	11.2	107	3,194	3,226	88	1.34	106	1086	1065	112	4,323	94	28,514	81	15.2	115
PENNSYLVANIA	78/76	7.6	74%	2,748	2,721	107%	1.43	113%	1182	1125	164%	3,852	119%	36,097	146%	10.7	82%
	80/78	7.3	69	3,146	3,115	100	1.47	117	1479	1408	174	4,534	116	42,054	144	10.8	81
	81/79	6.9	63	3,180	3,148	94	1.48	118	1526	1454	174	4,614	111	42,667	140	10.8	79
	82/80	7.2	66	3,424	3,494	98	1.50	120	1712	1662	186	5,188	116	46,509	142	11.2	82
	83/81	7.5	72	3,777	3,740	102	1.56	124	2115	2054	216	5,777	125	47,208	135	12.2	93
RHODE ISLAND	78/76	8.5	83%	2,512	2,538	100%	1.39	109%	980	933	136%	3,492	108%	26,577	108%	13.1	101%
	80/78	9.2	87	2,896	2,926	94	1.34	106	985	938	116	3,881	99	28,550	97	13.6	102
	81/79	8.8	80	3,076	3,107	93	1.35	108	1076	1025	123	4,152	100	28,967	95	14.3	105
	82/80	8.4	77	3,170	3,234	91	1.36	109	1141	1108	124	4,354	98	30,916	94	14.1	103
	83/81	8.3	80	3,416	3,485	95	1.37	109	1264	1227	129	4,727	103	31,911	91	14.8	113

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY'S 1978, 1980-83*

		#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
		High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
SOUTH CAROLINA	78/76	13.4	94%	1.98	96%	26.5	91%	114	107	113	29.9	103%	561	78%	84.4	84%	474	66%
	80/78	13.1	95	2.02	99	26.5	94	114	107	113	30.0	106	635	77	86.4	86	549	67
	81/79	13.3	95	2.00	98	26.5	93	114	107	113	30.0	105	657	76	91.3	91	600	69
	82/80	13.3	98	2.09	97	27.7	96	109	105	108	29.9	103	714	75	95.5	95	682	72
	83/81	13.0	98	2.13	95	27.6	94	109	105	108	29.8	101	774	75	95.3	95	737	72
SOUTH DAKOTA	78/76	17.5	123%	1.54	75%	26.9	92%	89	113	94	25.3	87%	655	91%	91.0	91%	595	83%
	80/78	17.1	124	1.67	82	28.6	102	89	113	94	26.9	96	759	92	83.9	84	637	77
	81/79	17.0	122	1.69	83	28.8	101	89	113	94	27.0	95	822	95	83.9	84	690	80
	82/80	16.4	122	1.81	84	29.7	103	89	115	94	27.9	96	859	91	88.3	88	758	80
	83/81	16.1	122	1.98	89	31.8	108	89	115	94	29.9	101	888	86	92.9	93	825	80
TENNESSEE	78/76	12.5	88%	1.94	95%	24.4	84%	107	106	107	26.1	89%	597	83%	80.4	80%	480	67%
	80/78	11.5	83	2.21	108	25.4	90	107	106	107	27.2	96	677	82	84.1	84	569	69
	81/79	11.6	83	2.22	108	25.7	90	107	106	107	27.5	97	701	81	86.8	87	609	70
	82/80	12.0	89	2.17	101	26.0	90	109	107	109	28.3	98	750	79	84.2	84	632	67
	83/81	12.2	92	2.10	94	25.6	87	109	107	109	27.9	95	813	79	87.0	87	707	69
TEXAS	78/76	12.8	90%	2.56	125%	32.8	112%	108	103	107	35.1	120%	834	116%	67.4	67%	563	78%
	80/78	12.8	92	2.45	120	31.4	111	108	103	107	33.6	119	958	116	64.2	64	615	75
	81/79	12.6	91	2.50	122	31.5	111	108	103	107	33.7	119	1,011	117	64.4	64	651	75
	82/80	12.5	92	2.53	118	31.5	109	109	102	107	33.7	116	1,168	123	64.9	65	753	80
	83/81	12.1	92	2.56	115	31.0	106	109	102	107	33.2	113	1,360	132	64.6	65	878	85
UTAH	78/76	15.8	111%	2.21	108%	35.0	120%	105	118	108	37.8	129%	640	89%	89.4	89%	572	80%
	80/78	15.1	109	2.12	104	31.9	113	105	118	108	34.5	122	734	89	91.2	91	670	81
	81/79	14.5	104	2.23	109	32.2	113	105	118	108	34.8	122	752	87	99.3	99	747	86
	82/80	13.9	103	2.36	110	32.8	113	104	117	106	34.7	120	812	86	101.2	101	821	87
	83/81	13.4	102	2.41	108	32.4	110	104	117	106	34.3	117	890	86	97.0	97	863	84
VERMONT	78/76	15.8	112%	1.83	89%	29.0	99%	86	97	88	25.5	87%	669	93%	108.8	109%	728	101%
	80/78	15.9	115	1.76	86	27.9	99	86	97	88	24.6	87	726	88	103.6	104	752	91
	81/79	15.7	113	1.72	84	27.0	95	86	97	88	23.7	84	740	85	109.5	109	810	93
	82/80	15.2	113	1.81	84	27.6	95	86	97	88	24.3	84	803	85	104.2	104	837	88
	83/81	14.2	108	1.93	86	27.5	93	86	97	88	24.2	82	864	84	105.2	105	909	88
VIRGINIA	78/76	13.5	95%	2.16	105%	29.3	100%	99	103	100	29.3	100%	662	92%	90.2	90%	597	83%
	80/78	13.1	94	2.24	110	29.3	104	99	103	100	29.3	104	759	92	86.6	87	657	80
	81/79	13.4	97	2.26	110	30.3	107	99	103	100	30.3	107	803	93	88.3	88	710	82
	82/80	13.3	98	2.36	110	31.3	108	99	102	100	31.3	108	899	95	88.3	88	794	84
	83/81	13.2	100	2.50	112	33.0	112	99	102	100	33.0	112	969	94	89.5	89	867	84
WASHINGTON	78/76	14.4	102%	2.86	139%	41.3	141%	96	94	96	39.6	136%	719	100%	99.0	99%	712	99%
	80/78	13.7	99	2.93	144	40.1	142	96	94	96	38.5	137	842	102	95.3	95	802	97
	81/79	13.4	97	3.11	152	41.7	147	96	94	96	40.0	141	896	103	96.3	96	863	100
	82/80	12.8	95	3.29	153	42.2	146	97	96	97	41.0	142	974	103	93.7	94	913	96
	83/81	12.6	96	3.02	135	38.1	129	97	96	97	36.9	126	1,021	99	92.1	92	940	91

58

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

59

Table 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1978, 1980-83* (continued)

		#6 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Actions (#5x #6x #7)	
		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
SOUTH CAROLINA	78/76	16.0	156%	2,864	2,512	99%	1.20	94%	573	535	78%	3,041	94%	18,745	76%	16.2	124%
	80/78	17.7	167	3,657	3,208	103	1.19	94	695	649	80	3,851	98	21,204	72	18.2	136
	81/79	18.3	168	4,147	3,638	109	1.19	95	788	736	88	4,367	105	21,909	72	19.9	146
	82/80	16.7	153	4,112	3,773	106	1.20	96	822	783	88	4,569	102	23,883	73	19.1	141
	83/81	15.4	148	4,126	3,785	104	1.21	96	866	825	87	4,623	100	25,960	74	17.8	135
SOUTH DAKOTA	78/76	10.0	98%	2,223	2,498	98%	1.41	111%	911	807	118%	3,335	103%	25,878	105%	12.9	99%
	80/78	11.4	107	2,529	2,842	92	1.32	105	809	716	89	3,552	91	28,207	96	12.6	94
	81/79	10.8	98	2,584	2,903	87	1.30	104	775	686	82	3,573	86	30,402	100	11.8	86
	82/80	10.0	91	2,545	2,859	80	1.34	107	865	752	84	3,627	81	30,806	94	11.8	86
	83/81	9.5	90	2,456	2,759	75	1.40	111	982	854	90	3,657	79	29,737	85	12.3	93
TENNESSEE	78/76	11.1	108%	2,185	2,042	80%	1.34	106%	743	701	102%	2,736	85%	22,888	93%	12.0	91%
	80/78	12.5	118	2,810	2,627	85	1.29	102	815	769	95	3,388	87	24,922	85	13.6	102
	81/79	12.3	112	2,906	2,716	81	1.25	100	727	685	82	3,395	81	25,520	84	13.3	97
	82/80	12.3	113	2,990	2,743	77	1.24	99	718	671	75	3,401	76	26,496	81	12.8	94
	83/81	11.8	113	3,246	2,978	81	1.27	101	876	819	86	3,782	82	29,104	83	13.0	99
TEXAS	78/76	15.0	145%	2,566	2,376	94%	1.15	91%	385	374	55%	2,758	86%	23,786	96%	11.6	89%
	80/78	16.4	154	3,209	2,971	96	1.15	91	481	467	58	3,449	88	28,553	98	12.1	90
	81/79	16.8	154	3,468	3,211	96	1.15	92	520	505	61	3,728	89	29,973	98	12.4	91
	82/80	18.1	166	4,366	4,005	112	1.15	92	655	642	72	4,692	105	34,681	106	13.5	99
	83/81	16.2	155	4,588	4,209	115	1.15	91	688	675	71	4,931	107	40,945	117	12.0	92
UTAH	78/76	16.1	156%	2,633	2,507	99%	1.29	102%	763	647	94%	3,145	98%	16,953	69%	18.5	142%
	80/78	15.9	150	3,338	3,179	102	1.26	100	868	735	91	3,894	100	21,294	73	18.3	137
	81/79	15.2	139	3,526	3,358	101	1.24	99	846	717	86	4,048	97	21,606	71	18.7	137
	82/80	14.4	132	3,609	3,470	97	1.24	99	866	740	83	4,221	95	23,366	71	18.1	133
	83/81	15.0	144	3,996	3,843	105	1.26	100	1039	888	93	4,750	103	25,935	74	18.3	139
VERMONT	78/76	6.0	58%	1,502	1,746	69%	2.26	178%	1892	1951	285%	3,857	120%	26,246	106%	14.7	112%
	80/78	6.8	64	1,821	2,117	68	2.27	180	2312	2384	295	4,696	120	29,552	101	15.9	119
	81/79	6.6	60	1,970	2,291	69	2.26	181	2482	2559	307	5,059	121	31,163	102	16.2	119
	82/80	7.0	64	2,118	2,462	69	2.38	190	2922	3013	337	5,727	128	33,093	101	17.3	127
	83/81	7.0	67	2,308	2,683	73	2.44	194	3323	3426	361	6,399	139	35,767	102	17.9	136
VIRGINIA	78/76	10.6	103%	2,161	2,182	86%	1.37	108%	799	776	113%	2,960	92%	22,605	92%	13.1	100%
	80/78	12.5	118	2,793	2,822	91	1.37	109	1034	1003	124	3,827	98	25,869	88	14.8	111
	81/79	13.2	121	3,094	3,126	94	1.33	106	1021	991	119	4,116	99	26,489	87	15.5	114
	82/80	12.4	114	3,150	3,182	89	1.31	105	977	957	107	4,127	92	28,671	87	14.4	106
	83/81	12.7	122	3,343	3,377	92	1.32	105	1070	1049	110	4,413	96	29,409	84	15.0	114
WASHINGTON	78/76	14.5	140%	2,496	2,600	102%	1.17	92%	424	451	66%	3,042	94%	18,153	74%	16.8	128%
	80/78	14.7	138	2,932	3,055	98	1.19	94	557	593	73	3,635	93	21,868	75	16.6	124
	81/79	13.0	119	2,699	2,812	84	1.19	95	513	546	65	3,346	80	22,376	73	15.0	109
	82/80	11.7	107	2,530	2,608	73	1.19	95	481	501	56	3,104	70	23,786	73	13.0	96
	83/81	11.2	107	2,764	2,850	78	1.20	95	553	576	61	3,419	74	27,641	79	12.4	94

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY'S 1978, 1980-83*

		#1 Resident Student Source High School Grads		#2 College Attendance Ratio		ENROL Student Enrollment (#1 x #2)		#3 System Cost Index			ENROL ADJ Student Enrollment Adjusted (ENROL x #3)		#4 Tax Capacity		#5 Tax Effort		TAX Tax Revenue (#4 x #5)	
		High School Grads per 1,000 pop.	Index	FTE Public Students per High School Grad	Index	FTE Public Students per 1,000 pop.	Index	App.	Tuition	Total	Public Students Load Adjusted per 1,000 pop.	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index	Percent	Index	Dollars per Capita	Index
WEST VIRGINIA	78/76	13.6	96%	2.01	98%	27.3	94%	100	112	102	27.9	95%	647	90%	87.5	88%	567	79%
	80/78	12.9	93	2.04	100	26.2	93	100	112	102	26.7	95	751	91	76.5	76	574	70
	81/79	12.6	91	2.09	102	26.3	93	100	112	102	26.8	94	800	92	82.2	82	658	76
	82/80	12.4	92	2.19	102	27.2	94	99	113	102	27.7	96	891	94	82.1	82	731	77
	83/81	12.5	95	2.22	99	27.8	94	99	113	102	28.3	96	926	90	83.1	83	770	75
WISCONSIN	78/76	16.7	118%	2.11	103%	35.3	121%	105	110	106	37.4	128%	698	97%	113.9	114%	795	110%
	80/78	16.8	121	2.06	101	34.6	123	105	110	106	36.7	130	809	98	119.5	119	966	117
	81/79	16.7	121	2.14	105	35.9	126	105	110	106	38.0	134	862	99	118.2	118	1,019	118
	82/80	16.1	120	2.30	107	37.2	129	103	107	104	38.7	134	897	94	116.3	116	1,043	110
	83/81	15.8	120	2.42	108	38.1	129	103	107	104	39.6	135	936	91	120.3	120	1,125	109
WYOMING	78/76	14.8	104%	2.41	117%	35.5	122%	81	99	85	30.2	104%	1,264	176%	66.1	66%	836	116%
	80/78	14.3	103	2.29	113	32.7	116	84	99	85	27.8	99	1,248	151	88.1	88	1,099	133
	81/79	13.5	97	2.31	113	31.1	109	81	99	85	26.4	93	1,501	173	82.8	83	1,244	143
	82/80	13.1	97	2.34	109	30.6	106	80	104	86	26.3	91	1,854	195	74.4	74	1,378	145
	83/81	12.8	97	2.45	110	31.5	107	80	104	86	27.1	92	2,226	216	72.5	73	1,614	157
UNITED STATES	78/76	14.2	100%	2.06	100%	29.2	100%	100	100	100	29.2	100%	719	100%	100.0	100%	719	100%
	80/78	13.9	100	2.03	100	28.2	100	100	100	100	28.2	100	825	100	100.0	100	825	100
	81/79	13.9	100	2.05	100	28.4	100	100	100	100	28.4	100	867	100	100.0	100	867	100
	82/80	13.5	100	2.15	100	28.9	100	100	100	100	28.9	100	949	100	100.0	100	949	100
	83/81	13.2	100	2.23	100	29.4	100	100	100	100	29.4	100	1,029	100	100.0	100	1,029	100

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

Table 4 SEVEN FACTORS IN STATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1978, 1980-83* (continued)

		#6 Allocation to Public Higher Education		APP Appropriations per Student (TAX x #6/ENROL)			#7 Tuition Factor		TUITION Estimated Tuition per Student APP (TUITION FACTOR-1.00)			OUTPUT Estimated Appropriation & Tuition Revenue per Student Adjusted (APP + TUITION)		INPUTS Potential Tax Revenues per Student Adjusted (#4/ #1x #2x #3)		PROCESS Collective Financial Actions (#5x #6x #7)	
		Percent of Tax Revenues	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Factor Value	Index	Dollars per Student Actual	Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Dollars per Student Adjusted	Index	Percent	Index
WEST VIRGINIA	78/76	12.7	124%	2,641	2,641	104%	1.14	90%	370	330	48%	2,952	92%	23,242	94%	12.7	97%
	80/78	14.4	136	3,153	3,153	102	1.11	88	347	310	38	3,431	88	28,080	96	12.2	91
	81/79	13.1	119	3,266	3,266	98	1.14	91	457	408	49	3,651	88	29,826	98	12.2	90
	82/80	12.9	118	3,465	3,500	98	1.16	93	554	491	55	3,940	88	32,096	98	12.3	90
	83/81	12.1	116	3,351	3,385	93	1.16	92	536	474	50	3,811	83	32,689	93	11.7	89
WISCONSIN	78/76	11.7	114%	2,641	2,515	99%	1.30	102%	792	720	105%	3,239	100%	18,647	76%	17.4	133%
	80/78	11.3	107	3,167	3,016	97	1.32	105	1013	921	114	3,943	101	22,064	75	17.9	134
	81/79	11.7	107	3,314	3,156	95	1.31	105	1027	934	112	4,095	98	22,685	74	18.1	132
	82/80	11.8	108	3,314	3,217	90	1.32	106	1060	991	111	4,206	94	23,192	71	18.1	133
	83/81	11.4	109	3,364	3,266	89	1.34	106	1144	1069	113	4,335	94	23,624	68	18.3	139
WYOMING	78/76	14.6	141%	3,425	4,229	167%	1.21	95%	719	727	106%	4,876	151%	41,824	170%	11.7	89%
	80/78	12.9	121	4,316	5,138	166	1.16	92	691	698	86	5,890	151	44,841	153	13.1	98
	81/79	14.5	133	5,816	7,180	215	1.15	92	872	881	106	7,868	189	56,805	186	13.9	101
	82/80	14.7	135	6,608	8,260	231	1.14	91	925	890	100	8,759	196	70,473	215	12.4	91
	83/81	14.3	137	7,354	9,192	251	1.12	89	882	848	89	9,577	208	82,204	235	11.7	89
UNITED STATES	78/76	10.3	100%	2,539	2,539	100%	1.27	100%	685	685	100%	3,224	100%	24,659	100%	13.1	100%
	80/78	10.6	100	3,104	3,104	100	1.26	100	807	307	100	3,911	100	29,283	100	13.4	100
	81/79	10.9	100	3,334	3,334	100	1.25	100	834	834	100	4,168	100	30,488	100	13.7	100
	82/80	10.9	100	3,572	3,572	100	1.25	100	893	893	100	4,465	100	32,803	100	13.6	100
	83/81	10.4	100	3,655	3,655	100	1.26	100	950	950	100	4,605	100	34,991	100	13.2	100

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb) and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 5
THE BASIC DATA
FY 1978, 1980-83*

		A	B	C	D	E	Fa	Fb	F	Ga	Gt	G	H
		Resident Population July (000)	High School Graduates Spring	FTE Public Enrollment Fall	Tax Capacity FY (000,000)	Tax Revenues FY (000,000)	State Appro-priations (000,000)	Local Appro-priations (000,000)	State & Local Appro-priations (000,000)	System Cost Index Appn.	System Cost Index Tuit	System Cost Index FY	Tuition Factor FY
ALABAMA	78/76	3,737	49,497	112,849	2,069.9	1,668.3	279.6	1.6	281.2	.99	1.05	1.00	1.27
	80/78	3,834	48,669	120,085	2,404.6	1,971.6	317.4	1.7	319.1	.99	1.05	1.00	1.27
	81/79	3,869	51,088	116,491	2,551.8	2,186.8	368.2	1.7	369.9	.99	1.05	1.00	1.26
	82/80	3,895	49,116	119,858	2,799.8	2,384.9	371.1	4.0	375.1	1.00	1.05	1.01	1.27
	83/81	3,917	48,794	122,761	3,003.0	2,720.0	392.4	4.0	396.4	1.00	1.05	1.01	1.28
ALASKA	78/76	392	4,309	8,654	442.7	417.8	64.0	0.0	64.0	.85	.83	.84	1.12
	80/78	401	4,598	11,992	612.2	712.4	72.5	0.0	72.5	.85	.83	.84	1.09
	81/79	402	5,281	10,669	757.4	977.0	81.9	0.0	81.9	.85	.83	.84	1.09
	82/80	403	5,432	11,632	990.3	1,646.2	122.4	0.0	122.4	.87	.89	.88	1.09
	83/81	412	5,518	11,728	1,373.0	2,533.0	148.5	0.0	148.5	.87	.89	.88	1.09
ARIZONA	78/76	2,348	27,207	111,668	1,570.8	1,660.4	215.6	45.4	261.0	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.24
	80/78	2,518	32,847	112,697	1,890.9	2,067.8	238.4	60.5	298.9	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.25
	81/79	2,639	31,648	115,973	2,078.5	2,382.4	278.2	65.5	343.7	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.28
	82/80	2,731	30,640	117,905	2,291.7	2,690.6	316.4	71.7	388.1	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.29
	83/81	2,794	28,143	118,911	2,552.0	2,702.0	294.0	74.3	368.3	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.30
ARKANSAS	78/76	2,169	27,787	46,176	1,232.6	956.9	126.2	0.0	126.2	1.11	1.06	1.10	1.27
	80/78	2,241	28,754	46,577	1,442.5	1,156.8	156.3	0.0	156.3	1.11	1.06	1.10	1.21
	81/79	2,269	29,502	48,847	1,522.2	1,239.8	164.7	0.0	164.7	1.11	1.06	1.10	1.20
	82/80	2,299	30,209	52,663	1,717.2	1,468.5	174.1	0.0	174.1	1.12	1.07	1.11	1.22
	83/81	2,296	30,691	51,893	1,928.0	1,522.0	186.5	0.0	186.5	1.12	1.07	1.11	1.25
CALIFORNIA	78/76	21,935	291,606	974,114	17,777.7	20,749.5	1,915.5	764.5	2,680.0	.87	.81	.86	1.10
	80/78	22,839	282,321	893,323	21,694.3	25,203.3	2,764.1	251.9	3,016.0	.87	.81	.86	1.09
	81/79	23,255	289,953	913,538	23,353.0	22,107.8	3,104.8	300.0	3,404.8	.87	.81	.86	1.09
	82/80	23,771	282,038	922,287	26,331.8	26,800.5	3,269.9	441.0	3,710.9	.87	.82	.86	1.10
	83/81	24,196	267,153	985,615	28,698.0	28,796.0	3,221.3	391.5	3,612.8	.87	.82	.86	1.10
COLORADO	78/76	2,632	37,291	108,582	2,044.8	1,880.4	220.9	4.7	225.6	1.05	1.03	1.06	1.43
	80/78	2,767	38,885	105,918	2,511.7	2,285.9	244.8	5.9	250.7	1.05	1.03	1.08	1.45
	81/79	2,849	39,340	107,421	2,719.5	2,615.9	278.6	6.8	285.4	1.05	1.03	1.06	1.46
	82/80	2,903	38,787	109,154	3,094.4	2,797.4	310.7	7.9	318.6	1.03	1.10	1.05	1.50
	83/81	2,965	37,729	110,808	3,442.0	2,877.0	350.4	10.2	360.6	1.03	1.10	1.05	1.50
CONNECTICUT	78/76	3,086	48,037	63,901	2,397.5	2,424.5	160.0	0.0	160.0	.97	.96	.97	1.23
	80/78	3,095	46,839	62,896	2,758.4	2,755.4	181.4	0.0	181.4	.97	.96	.97	1.23
	81/79	3,100	46,883	63,306	2,914.3	2,980.6	209.8	0.0	209.8	.97	.96	.97	1.22
	82/80	3,114	46,276	64,422	3,297.2	3,291.9	229.4	0.0	229.4	1.00	.98	.99	1.21
	83/81	3,134	47,041	65,903	3,547.0	3,643.0	247.5	0.0	247.5	1.00	.98	.99	1.21
DELAWARE	78/76	593	9,483	21,280	524.7	447.1	44.2	0.0	44.2	1.11	1.23	1.14	1.54
	80/78	598	9,382	21,583	572.4	494.9	53.3	0.0	53.3	1.11	1.23	1.14	1.62
	81/79	599	9,453	22,125	568.3	542.5	63.8	0.0	63.8	1.11	1.23	1.14	1.59
	82/80	596	8,985	23,040	631.2	561.4	72.1	0.0	72.1	1.08	1.19	1.11	1.59
	83/81	598	8,815	23,055	683.0	593.0	76.9	0.0	76.9	1.08	1.19	1.11	1.53
D.C.	78/76	696	6,442	10,910	580.8	648.7	0.0	36.5	36.5	.90	.98	.92	1.05
	80/78	670	6,372	7,985	630.3	797.5	0.0	48.2	48.2	.90	.98	.92	1.07
	81/79	656	7,365	8,671	624.6	826.1	0.0	53.0	53.0	.90	.98	.92	1.07
	82/80	637	6,543	8,053	672.8	882.7	0.0	53.0	53.0	.92	.98	.94	1.06
	83/81	631	6,462	8,274	721.0	1,049.0	0.0	60.8	60.8	.92	.98	.94	1.05

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb), and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 5

THE BASIC DATA

FY 1978, 1980-83*

		A	B	C	D	E	Fa	Fb	F	Ga	Gt	G	H
		Resident Population July (000)	High School Graduates Spring	FTE Public Enrollment Fall	Tax Capacity FY (000,000)	Tax Revenues FY (000,000)	State Appro-priations (000,000)	Local Appro-priations (000,000)	State & Local Appro-priations (000,000)	System Cost Index Appn.	System Cost Index Tuit	System Cost Index FY	Tuition Factor FY
FLORIDA	78/76	8,695	95,632	210,874	6,504.9	4,764.6	484.0	0.0	484.0	.89	.89	.89	1.28
	80/78	9,132	97,286	218,303	7,686.6	5,644.7	617.2	0.0	617.2	.89	.89	.89	1.27
	81/79	9,471	97,742	223,590	8,200.2	6,414.4	704.0	0.0	704.0	.89	.89	.80	1.25
	82/80	9,874	97,563	232,801	9,355.3	6,908.2	799.4	0.0	799.4	.92	.90	.91	1.23
	83/81	10,183	99,124	230,176	10,596.0	7,762.0	843.2	0.0	843.2	.92	.90	.91	1.23
GEORGIA	78/76	5,126	64,798	115,133	3,134.3	2,726.8	302.9	2.0	304.9	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.29
	80/78	5,286	64,518	114,193	3,620.6	3,237.3	385.1	2.9	388.0	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.24
	81/79	5,391	67,057	113,700	3,800.7	3,637.5	432.0	3.3	435.3	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.20
	82/80	5,482	66,775	111,834	4,262.4	4,100.2	498.8	3.5	502.4	1.06	1.07	1.06	1.20
	83/81	5,574	68,394	117,340	4,672.0	4,545.0	534.2	3.5	537.7	1.06	1.07	1.06	1.21
HAWAII	78/76	902	13,448	35,492	700.8	829.1	109.6	0.0	109.6	1.00	1.06	1.01	1.16
	80/78	929	13,377	34,295	805.0	938.5	119.1	0.0	119.1	1.00	1.06	1.01	1.13
	81/79	950	14,049	33,784	846.3	1,080.1	135.4	0.0	135.4	1.00	1.06	1.01	1.12
	82/80	969	14,013	33,609	978.3	1,217.9	154.8	0.0	154.8	.97	1.04	.99	1.12
	83/81	981	14,100	34,429	1,056.0	1,327.0	185.1	0.0	185.1	.97	1.04	.99	1.11
IDAHO	78/76	857	12,127	24,810	542.5	490.6	76.1	1.9	78.0	.87	1.03	.90	1.14
	80/78	911	13,452	23,732	669.1	594.5	82.7	2.2	84.9	.87	1.03	.90	1.12
	81/79	933	13,736	24,747	738.1	671.0	93.0	2.7	95.7	.87	1.03	.90	1.13
	82/80	947	13,496	26,574	786.1	694.2	93.9	2.9	96.8	.87	1.05	.91	1.16
	83/81	959	12,993	26,110	854.0	743.0	91.8	3.4	95.2	.87	1.05	.91	1.17
ILLINOIS	78/76	11,360	168,672	324,773	9,152.4	8,639.8	671.7	101.5	773.2	1.02	.94	1.01	1.21
	80/78	11,434	161,721	314,674	10,577.8	10,062.3	807.1	103.4	910.5	1.02	.94	1.01	1.23
	81/79	11,423	162,357	306,099	11,067.7	10,941.5	884.0	132.6	1,016.6	1.02	.94	1.01	1.22
	82/80	11,433	157,545	304,840	11,688.0	11,977.9	913.8	159.8	1,073.6	1.01	.96	1.00	1.22
	83/81	11,462	157,600	340,115	12,265.0	12,883.0	925.8	170.7	1,096.5	1.01	.96	1.00	1.23
INDIANA	78/76	5,372	81,988	130,074	3,787.1	3,118.3	352.4	0.1	352.5	1.12	1.25	1.14	1.35
	80/78	5,446	77,282	126,766	4,449.2	3,676.1	411.2	0.1	411.3	1.12	1.25	1.14	1.35
	81/79	5,475	80,268	132,276	4,647.3	3,913.8	459.6	0.1	459.7	1.12	1.25	1.14	1.34
	82/80	5,489	78,370	142,928	4,814.8	4,056.1	482.5	0.1	482.6	1.10	1.21	1.12	1.35
	83/81	5,468	78,749	146,340	5,098.0	4,510.0	485.3	0.2	485.5	1.10	1.21	1.12	1.36
IOWA	78/76	2,904	45,894	73,103	2,172.6	2,010.8	215.1	9.3	224.4	1.12	1.17	1.13	1.30
	80/78	2,918	47,970	75,395	2,553.3	2,258.9	266.7	10.3	277.0	1.12	1.17	1.13	1.28
	81/79	2,917	49,163	77,217	2,734.5	2,547.6	281.2	11.5	292.7	1.12	1.17	1.13	1.27
	82/80	2,913	47,701	82,829	2,914.0	2,789.5	306.7	12.6	319.3	1.11	1.13	1.11	1.28
	83/81	2,899	46,472	84,933	3,054.0	2,999.0	350.6	13.5	364.1	1.11	1.13	1.11	1.29
KANSAS	78/76	2,299	33,923	84,023	1,753.0	1,504.4	192.3	19.3	211.6	1.13	1.07	1.12	1.27
	80/78	2,333	34,591	85,643	2,040.8	1,743.9	245.7	28.4	274.1	1.13	1.07	1.12	1.26
	81/79	2,347	34,087	87,205	2,224.2	1,937.0	271.0	35.8	306.8	1.13	1.07	1.12	1.23
	82/80	2,367	32,773	89,229	2,445.8	2,150.2	287.2	36.4	323.6	1.15	1.07	1.13	1.24
	83/81	2,383	31,208	90,003	2,681.0	2,332.0	299.3	42.7	342.0	1.15	1.07	1.13	1.22
KENTUCKY	78/76	3,530	44,721	84,945	2,158.4	1,880.8	217.4	0.0	217.4	1.08	1.16	1.09	1.31
	80/78	3,611	44,934	83,622	2,503.1	2,067.6	299.9	0.0	299.9	1.08	1.16	1.09	1.27
	81/79	3,644	45,250	85,194	2,681.2	2,324.2	307.6	0.0	307.6	1.08	1.16	1.09	1.23
	82/80	3,662	45,401	89,377	2,888.9	2,561.0	355.3	0.0	355.3	1.08	1.14	1.09	1.21
	83/81	3,662	46,262	89,967	3,090.0	2,732.0	363.6	0.0	363.6	1.08	1.14	1.09	1.24

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb), and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 5

THE BASIC DATA

FY 1978, 1980-83*

		A	B	C	D	E	Fa	Fb	F	Ga	Gt	G	H
		Resident Population July (000)	High School Graduates Spring	FTE Public Enrollment Fall	Tax Capacity FY (000,000)	Tax Revenues FY (000,000)	State Appro-priations (000,000)	Local Appro-priations (000,000)	State & Local Appro-priations (000,000)	System Cost Index Appn.	System Cost Index Tuit	System Cost Index FY	Tuition Factor FY
LOUISIANA	78/76	3,952	54,106	110,251	2,928.2	2,342.4	240.9	0.0	240.9	1.11	1.06	1.10	1.22
	80/78	4,073	54,086	106,487	3,462.0	2,673.3	328.0	0.0	328.0	1.11	1.06	1.10	1.24
	81/79	4,139	55,477	107,248	3,711.8	3,050.2	395.7	0.0	395.7	1.11	1.06	1.10	1.22
	82/80	4,222	55,572	111,510	4,368.4	3,395.5	451.7	0.0	451.7	1.13	1.07	1.12	1.20
	83/81	4,308	56,072	119,379	5,171.0	3,968.0	480.1	0.0	480.1	1.13	1.07	1.12	1.19
MAINE	78/76	1,090	16,472	23,481	650.8	718.4	44.5	0.0	44.5	.91	1.17	.96	1.37
	80/78	1,115	16,588	22,542	745.3	808.5	56.0	0.0	56.0	.91	1.17	.96	1.49
	81/79	1,125	17,250	23,593	781.3	856.6	61.4	0.0	61.4	.91	1.17	.96	1.46
	82/80	1,126	17,314	24,391	856.5	951.6	65.6	0.0	65.6	.88	.96	.90	1.45
	83/81	1,133	17,444	24,738	924.0	1,046.0	71.9	0.0	71.9	.88	.96	.90	1.47
MARYLAND	78/76	4,172	61,522	123,874	3,001.1	3,374.3	260.9	32.9	293.8	1.13	.95	1.09	1.40
	80/78	4,212	62,501	122,137	3,475.8	3,688.2	315.8	42.6	358.4	1.13	.95	1.09	1.42
	81/79	4,223	62,043	124,881	3,618.6	3,953.9	357.7	48.5	406.2	1.13	.05	1.00	1.38
	82/80	4,225	61,265	126,085	3,977.6	4,320.4	374.8	51.0	425.8	1.13	.97	1.10	1.38
	83/81	4,263	61,111	128,021	4,302.0	4,621.0	414.9	56.3	471.2	1.13	.97	1.10	1.38
MASSACHUSETTS	78/76	5,749	89,771	124,398	3,846.1	5,243.8	225.9	0.0	225.9	.91	.94	.91	1.22
	80/78	5,743	91,394	121,715	4,407.5	6,276.8	281.9	0.0	281.9	.91	.94	.91	1.22
	81/79	5,746	89,031	122,952	4,653.5	6,720.4	275.9	0.0	275.9	.91	.94	.91	1.21
	82/80	5,743	86,699	128,268	5,248.3	7,060.8	313.5	0.0	313.5	.89	.93	.90	1.22
	83/81	5,773	87,691	127,374	5,707.0	7,649.0	346.0	0.0	346.0	.89	.93	.90	1.36
MICHIGAN	78/76	9,117	140,237	293,842	6,689.5	6,819.3	635.1	40.2	675.3	1.02	1.08	1.03	1.44
	80/78	9,202	143,241	293,837	7,821.5	8,608.2	764.6	67.2	831.8	1.02	1.08	1.03	1.43
	81/79	9,249	144,314	302,462	8,342.1	9,443.3	703.9	75.0	778.9	1.02	1.08	1.03	1.41
	82/80	9,255	137,906	311,873	8,537.1	9,867.8	742.3	85.0	827.3	1.00	1.04	1.01	1.42
	83/81	9,204	137,824	312,458	9,116.0	10,584.0	820.4	90.0	910.4	1.00	1.04	1.01	1.52
MINNESOTA	78/76	3,957	70,345	113,564	2,761.1	3,261.9	298.5	0.0	298.5	1.14	1.18	1.15	1.28
	80/78	4,005	71,229	113,336	3,338.1	3,836.9	362.1	0.0	362.1	1.14	1.18	1.15	1.27
	81/79	4,038	70,739	115,500	3,685.9	4,254.0	370.6	0.0	370.6	1.14	1.18	1.15	1.26
	82/80	4,083	69,479	121,614	3,961.6	4,402.6	397.4	0.0	397.4	1.13	1.15	1.13	1.27
	83/81	4,094	67,745	125,579	4,220.0	4,591.0	420.7	0.0	420.7	1.13	1.15	1.13	1.30
MISSISSIPPI	78/76	2,430	29,308	75,131	1,241.1	1,144.5	173.7	9.4	183.1	1.01	1.00	1.01	1.27
	80/78	2,488	29,363	74,006	1,437.2	1,345.5	217.6	11.3	228.9	1.01	1.00	1.01	1.26
	81/79	2,508	31,706	76,459	1,522.5	1,469.6	242.9	12.5	255.4	1.01	1.00	1.01	1.24
	82/80	2,523	31,216	76,346	1,662.3	1,603.6	262.0	13.1	275.1	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.25
	83/81	2,531	31,805	81,356	1,866.0	1,766.0	275.8	14.3	290.1	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.25
MISSOURI	78/76	4,824	70,904	117,828	3,296.6	2,724.4	244.1	16.7	260.8	.97	1.04	.99	1.31
	80/78	4,871	71,107	116,360	3,818.7	3,037.4	298.4	17.6	316.0	.97	1.04	.99	1.28
	81/79	4,889	71,804	114,167	4,118.9	3,380.2	326.5	21.9	348.4	.97	1.04	.99	1.27
	82/80	4,924	69,825	121,248	4,376.4	3,657.1	307.1	22.2	329.3	.98	1.05	.99	1.27
	83/81	4,941	67,837	124,837	4,682.0	3,803.0	329.4	23.1	352.5	.98	1.05	.99	1.28
MONTANA	78/76	759	12,504	23,805	562.4	533.8	52.3	1.0	53.3	.89	1.10	.93	1.27
	80/78	784	12,452	23,846	698.7	614.4	60.5	1.1	61.6	.89	1.10	.93	1.25
	81/79	789	12,595	24,801	774.9	678.1	66.5	1.0	67.5	.89	1.10	.93	1.24
	82/80	788	12,625	26,282	841.5	775.5	83.7	1.9	85.6	.90	1.01	.93	1.23
	83/81	793	12,087	27,175	926.0	856.0	95.3	2.0	97.3	.90	1.01	.93	1.22

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb), and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 5

THE BASIC DATA

FY 1978, 1980-83*

		A	B	C	D	E	Fa	Fb	F	Ga	Gt	G	H
		Resident Population July (000)	High School Graduates Spring	FTE Public Enrollment Fall	Tax Capacity FY (000,000)	Tax Revenues FY (000,000)	State Appro-priations (000,000)	Local Appro-priations (000,000)	State & Local Appro-priations (000,000)	System Cost Index Appn.	System Cost Index Tuit	System Cost Index FY	Tuition Factor FY
NEBRASKA	78/76	1,549	24,822	48,879	1,125.4	1,021.3	131.0	12.5	143.5	1.22	1.10	1.20	1.28
	80/78	1,561	25,741	49,339	1,275.3	1,191.6	151.7	14.3	166.0	1.22	1.10	1.20	1.25
	81/79	1,564	25,611	51,153	1,350.1	1,317.7	165.9	18.5	184.4	1.22	1.10	1.20	1.25
	82/80	1,572	25,141	53,269	1,445.5	1,477.2	181.1	20.2	201.3	1.30	1.14	1.27	1.26
	83/81	1,577	24,408	53,920	1,572.0	1,490.0	187.0	20.7	207.7	1.30	1.14	1.27	1.26
NEVADA	78/76	647	7,665	17,459	707.4	500.4	45.5	0.0	45.5	.81	.81	.81	1.23
	80/78	719	8,579	18,026	913.7	556.0	56.9	0.0	56.9	.81	.81	.81	1.24
	81/79	765	8,655	20,058	1,017.8	663.4	62.1	0.0	62.1	.81	.81	.81	1.22
	82/80	807	8,791	20,895	1,173.6	698.4	65.9	0.0	65.9	.83	.84	.84	1.21
	83/81	845	9,368	22,156	1,287.0	793.0	75.2	0.0	75.2	.83	.84	.84	1.21
NEW HAMPSHIRE	78/76	847	12,788	19,569	621.5	469.7	27.5	0.0	27.5	.90	1.17	.95	2.12
	80/78	894	12,755	19,434	730.4	542.9	29.8	0.0	29.8	.90	1.17	.95	2.10
	81/79	912	14,248	19,834	761.2	596.4	32.9	0.0	32.9	.90	1.17	.95	2.16
	82/80	923	13,995	20,230	845.0	634.0	39.3	0.0	39.3	.85	1.21	.93	2.13
	83/81	936	13,703	21,161	919.0	679.0	35.2	0.0	35.2	.85	1.21	.93	2.21
NEW JERSEY	78/76	7,344	112,011	155,381	5,547.1	5,816.2	398.7	44.6	443.3	.95	.93	.95	1.31
	80/78	7,356	110,526	161,673	6,252.4	7,152.4	467.0	48.7	515.7	.95	.93	.95	1.30
	81/79	7,373	112,462	164,941	6,532.2	7,691.4	501.0	52.5	553.5	.95	.93	.95	1.29
	82/80	7,377	109,240	168,175	7,365.9	8,247.5	553.5	60.9	614.4	.95	.92	.95	1.29
	83/81	7,404	107,701	168,611	7,980.0	8,913.0	568.3	66.3	634.6	.95	.92	.95	1.30
NEW MEXICO	78/76	1,195	18,603	38,986	842.4	698.6	95.8	6.4	102.2	1.10	1.21	1.12	1.28
	80/78	1,252	19,056	38,655	1,053.8	874.6	125.7	3.0	128.7	1.10	1.21	1.12	1.21
	81/79	1,281	19,712	39,191	1,145.5	974.1	143.3	6.5	149.8	1.10	1.21	1.12	1.20
	82/80	1,305	19,365	40,848	1,324.1	1,100.7	171.6	5.5	177.1	1.10	1.19	1.12	1.21
	83/81	1,328	18,865	41,860	1,553.0	1,383.0	184.1	10.3	194.4	1.10	1.19	1.12	1.19
NEW YORK	78/76	17,975	243,330	415,100	12,154.5	20,614.6	1,083.5	165.2	1,248.7	.96	.89	.94	1.19
	80/78	17,720	240,523	404,324	13,316.8	22,360.2	1,322.0	206.8	1,528.8	.96	.89	.94	1.31
	81/79	17,634	243,844	408,337	13,614.0	23,275.6	1,417.5	220.2	1,637.7	.96	.89	.94	1.27
	82/80	17,575	238,079	413,715	15,057.5	25,201.5	1,569.2	226.4	1,795.6	.95	.89	.94	1.27
	83/81	17,602	230,986	417,967	16,129.0	27,586.0	1,706.6	206.7	1,913.3	.95	.89	.94	1.27
NORTH CAROLINA	78/76	5,593	73,498	162,104	3,339.4	2,883.6	447.2	18.6	465.8	.94	.99	.95	1.18
	80/78	5,739	74,171	167,150	3,883.5	3,358.0	561.9	22.8	584.7	.94	.99	.95	1.17
	81/79	5,802	73,937	169,719	4,109.4	3,736.4	640.0	25.4	665.4	.94	.99	.95	1.16
	82/80	5,888	75,436	179,205	4,441.6	4,304.0	715.0	29.7	744.7	.93	.99	.94	1.14
	83/81	5,953	73,657	184,913	4,874.0	4,644.0	768.4	30.6	799.0	.93	.99	.94	1.14
NORTH DAKOTA	78/76	645	11,951	25,327	454.7	428.8	61.2	0.5	61.7	.86	1.04	.90	1.25
	80/78	651	11,291	27,457	548.0	450.5	73.6	0.7	74.3	.86	1.04	.90	1.23
	81/79	652	11,130	26,827	613.5	476.7	77.7	0.8	78.5	.86	1.04	.90	1.21
	82/80	654	10,658	28,100	672.1	529.4	103.0	1.0	104.0	.86	1.07	.91	1.24
	83/81	658	10,638	29,119	836.0	619.0	103.3	1.2	104.5	.86	1.07	.91	1.25
OHIO	78/76	10,753	172,753	262,772	7,889.9	6,262.1	532.7	20.0	552.7	1.06	1.20	1.09	1.54
	80/78	10,795	167,644	258,442	9,096.3	7,417.0	649.3	21.2	670.5	1.06	1.20	1.09	1.50
	81/79	10,799	167,284	266,185	9,425.3	8,125.2	698.9	21.9	720.8	1.06	1.20	1.09	1.50
	82/80	10,800	160,370	277,575	9,940.3	8,616.7	718.1	22.6	740.7	1.05	1.22	1.09	1.49
	83/81	10,781	159,272	285,690	10,478.0	9,292.0	736.6	25.0	761.6	1.05	1.22	1.09	1.54

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb), and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 5

THE BASIC DATA

FY 1978, 1980-83*

		A	B	C	D	E	Fa	Fb	F	Ga	Gt	G	H
		Resident Population July (000)	High School Graduates Spring	FTE Public Enrollment Fall	Tax Capacity FY (000,000)	Tax Revenues FY (000,000)	State Appro-priations (000,000)	Local Appro-priations (000,000)	State & Local Appro-priations (000,000)	System Cost Index		System Cost Index	Tuition Factor
										Appn.	Tuit	FY	FY
OKLAHOMA	78/76	2,823	38,417	98,780	2,112.0	1,465.3	173.3	3.4	176.7	1.13	1.06	1.12	1.28
	80/78	2,913	39,633	97,214	2,548.1	1,796.3	228.8	3.1	231.8	1.13	1.06	1.12	1.26
	81/79	2,970	40,228	99,094	2,782.4	2,059.0	271.2	3.1	274.3	1.13	1.06	1.12	1.22
	82/80	3,038	40,324	102,321	3,360.5	2,404.4	325.6	3.8	329.4	1.14	1.07	1.12	1.20
	83/81	3,100	39,910	102,513	4,064.0	2,950.0	383.1	4.0	387.1	1.14	1.07	1.12	1.19
OREGON	78/76	2,372	32,294	93,899	1,740.4	1,638.2	189.5	34.7	224.2	1.00	.99	1.00	1.29
	80/78	2,510	31,791	90,430	2,174.9	1,943.0	229.1	42.9	272.0	1.00	.99	1.00	1.28
	81/79	2,578	31,707	94,677	2,377.5	2,202.7	218.5	53.6	272.1	1.00	.99	1.00	1.29
	82/80	2,638	31,564	97,698	2,582.3	2,409.9	249.9	59.4	309.3	.99	1.02	.99	1.30
	83/81	2,651	30,400	95,719	2,702.0	2,734.0	240.6	65.1	305.7	.99	1.02	.99	1.34
PENNSYLVANIA	78/76	11,887	189,376	225,274	8,294.4	8,112.5	595.3	23.7	619.0	1.01	1.05	1.02	1.43
	80/78	11,865	181,250	219,363	9,409.6	9,457.4	655.8	34.4	690.2	1.01	1.05	1.02	1.47
	81/79	11,874	184,488	220,044	9,576.3	10,096.1	660.8	38.9	699.7	1.01	1.05	1.02	1.48
	82/80	11,880	174,400	226,985	10,451.3	10,846.0	738.3	38.9	777.2	.98	1.03	.99	1.50
	83/81	11,871	171,482	229,544	11,053.0	11,580.0	824.5	42.6	867.1	1.01	1.03	1.02	1.56
RHODE ISLAND	78/76	950	12,639	22,369	594.5	658.7	56.2	0.0	56.2	.99	1.05	1.00	1.39
	80/78	957	12,661	23,513	671.3	737.5	68.1	0.0	68.1	.99	1.05	1.00	1.34
	81/79	957	13,014	24,027	696.0	842.2	73.9	0.0	73.9	.99	1.05	1.00	1.35
	82/80	949	12,801	24,671	755.1	929.8	78.2	0.0	78.2	.98	1.03	.99	1.36
	83/81	953	12,821	24,943	788.0	1,024.0	85.2	0.0	85.2	.98	1.03	.99	1.37
SOUTH CAROLINA	78/76	2,941	39,418	77,907	1,650.2	1,393.2	218.8	4.3	223.1	1.14	1.07	1.13	1.20
	80/78	3,041	39,897	80,645	1,932.3	1,669.6	289.5	5.4	294.9	1.14	1.07	1.13	1.19
	81/79	3,087	40,918	81,886	2,027.3	1,851.9	333.5	6.1	339.6	1.14	1.07	1.13	1.19
	82/80	3,127	41,463	86,568	2,232.9	2,131.8	348.9	7.1	356.0	1.09	1.05	1.08	1.20
	83/81	3,167	41,031	87,420	2,451.0	2,335.0	352.6	8.1	360.7	1.09	1.05	1.08	1.21
SOUTH DAKOTA	78/76	687	12,031	18,487	449.7	409.1	41.1	0.0	41.1	.89	1.13	.94	1.41
	80/78	689	11,806	19,729	523.1	439.1	49.9	0.0	49.9	.89	1.13	.94	1.32
	81/79	689	11,717	19,816	566.3	475.4	51.2	0.0	51.2	.89	1.13	.94	1.30
	82/80	690	11,321	20,475	592.9	523.3	52.1	0.0	52.1	.89	1.15	.94	1.34
	83/81	686	11,024	21,787	609.0	566.0	53.5	0.0	53.5	.89	1.15	.94	1.40
TENNESSEE	78/76	4,329	54,279	105,540	2,584.7	2,078.2	230.6	0.0	230.6	1.07	1.06	1.07	1.34
	80/78	4,462	51,346	113,223	3,019.3	2,538.4	318.2	0.0	318.2	1.07	1.06	1.07	1.29
	81/79	4,533	52,400	116,367	3,177.6	2,758 5	338.2	0.0	338.2	1.07	1.06	1.07	1.25
	82/80	4,595	55,061	119,404	3,448.5	2,902.6	357.0	0.0	357.0	1.09	1.07	1.09	1.24
	83/81	4,612	56,192	118,147	3,748.0	3,262.0	383.5	0.0	383.5	1.09	1.07	1.09	1.27
TEXAS	78/76	12,903	165,169	423,041	10,766.9	7,258.6	1,039.9	45.5	1,085.4	1.08	1.03	1.07	1.15
	80/78	13,498	172,782	423,256	12,931.0	8,303.5	1,302.6	55.5	1,358.1	1.08	1.03	1.07	1.15
	81/79	13,887	175,077	437,945	14,045.4	9,045.2	1,451.7	67.2	1,518.9	1.08	1.03	1.07	1.15
	82/80	14,321	178,356	450,669	16,723.5	10,858.7	1,887.8	79.6	1,967.4	1.09	1.02	1.07	1.15
	83/81	14,766	178,919	458,358	20,081.0	12,969.0	2,016.5	86.4	2,102.9	1.09	1.02	1.07	1.15
UTAH	78/76	1,272	20,108	44,479	814.4	727.7	117.1	0.0	117.1	1.05	1.18	1.08	1.29
	80/78	1,364	20,556	43,561	1,001.8	914.0	145.4	0.0	145.4	1.05	1.18	1.08	1.26
	81/79	1,416	20,469	45,631	1,064.8	1,057.8	160.9	0.0	160.9	1.05	1.18	1.08	1.24
	82/80	1,472	20,487	48,247	1,195.0	1,208.9	174.1	0.0	174.1	1.04	1.17	1.06	1.24
	83/81	1,518	20,365	49,144	1,351.0	1,310.0	196.4	0.0	196.4	1.04	1.17	1.06	1.26

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb), and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).

TABLE 5

THE BASIC DATA

FY 1978, 1980-83*

		A	B	C	D	E	Fa	Fb	F	Ga	Gt	G	H
		Resident Population July (000)	High School Graduates Spring	FTE Public Enrollment Fall	Tax Capacity FY (000,000)	Tax Revenues FY (000,000)	State Appro-priations (000,000)	Local Appro-priations (000,000)	State & Local Appro-priations (000,000)	System Cost Index Appn.	System Cost Index Tuit	System Cost Index FY	Tuition Factor FY
VERMONT	78/76	485	7,687	14,050	324.5	353.2	20.9	0.2	21.1	.86	.97	.88	2.26
	80/78	498	7,918	13,897	361.4	374.5	25.1	0.2	25.3	.86	.97	.88	2.27
	81/79	506	7,925	13,656	374.5	410.0	26.7	0.2	26.9	.86	.97	.88	2.26
	82/80	512	7,796	14,120	411.2	428.3	29.7	0.2	29.9	.86	.97	.88	2.38
	83/81	516	7,345	14,170	446.0	469.0	32.5	0.2	32.7	.86	.97	.88	2.44
VIRGINIA	78/76	5,133	69,450	150,279	3,397.0	3,065.5	324.7	0.0	324.7	.99	1.03	1.00	1.37
	80/78	5,284	69,178	155,075	4,011.6	3,474.0	433.2	0.0	433.2	.99	1.03	1.00	1.37
	81/79	5,325	71,399	161,453	4,276.7	3,778.3	499.6	0.0	499.6	.99	1.03	1.00	1.33
	82/80	5,362	71,073	168,045	4,818.1	4,256.0	529.4	0.0	529.4	.99	1.02	1.00	1.31
	83/81	5,430	71,657	178,926	5,262.0	4,709.0	598.2	0.0	598.2	.99	1.02	1.00	1.32
WASHINGTON	78/76	3,691	53,292	152,356	2,655.1	2,629.6	380.3	0.0	380.3	.96	.94	.96	1.17
	80/78	3,886	53,143	155,807	3,270.9	3,117.0	456.9	0.0	456.9	.96	.94	.96	1.19
	81/79	4,013	53,801	167,379	3,595.5	3,463.0	451.8	0.0	451.8	.96	.94	.96	1.19
	82/80	4,148	53,297	175,155	4,041.3	3,788.0	443.1	0.0	443.1	.97	.96	.97	1.19
	83/81	4,217	53,143	160,526	4,304.0	3,962.0	443.7	0.0	443.7	.97	.96	.97	1.20
WEST VIRGINIA	78/76	1,877	25,484	51,260	1,215.2	1,063.6	135.4	0.0	135.4	1.00	1.12	1.02	1.14
	80/78	1,920	24,698	50,339	1,441.8	1,102.9	158.7	0.0	158.7	1.00	1.12	1.02	1.11
	81/79	1,939	24,436	51,005	1,551.7	1,275.3	166.6	0.0	166.6	1.00	1.12	1.02	1.14
	82/80	1,950	24,227	53,049	1,736.7	1,426.3	183.8	0.0	183.8	.99	1.13	1.02	1.16
	83/81	1,952	24,430	54,224	1,808.0	1,503.0	181.7	0.0	181.7	.99	1.13	1.02	1.16
WISCONSIN	78/76	4,585	76,695	161,856	3,199.3	3,643.7	395.5	32.0	427.5	1.05	1.10	1.06	1.30
	80/78	4,631	77,871	160,138	3,745.2	4,475.1	463.3	43.8	507.1	1.05	1.10	1.06	1.32
	81/79	4,666	78,136	167,314	4,023.2	4,755.1	505.3	49.1	554.4	1.05	1.10	1.06	1.31
	82/80	4,728	76,250	175,749	4,239.0	4,931.8	525.4	57.0	582.4	1.03	1.07	1.04	1.32
	83/81	4,742	74,734	180,632	4,438.0	5,337.0	543.7	64.0	607.7	1.03	1.07	1.04	1.34
WYOMING	78/76	395	5,832	14,042	499.2	330.2	42.9	5.2	48.1	.81	.99	.85	1.21
	80/78	431	6,151	14,110	537.8	473.8	51.7	9.2	60.9	.84	.99	.85	1.16
	81/79	452	6,089	14,048	678.3	562.1	70.5	11.2	81.7	.81	.99	.85	1.15
	82/80	475	6,204	14,528	880.5	654.7	82.6	13.4	96.0	.80	1.04	.86	1.14
	83/81	492	6,318	15,489	1,095.0	794.0	97.2	16.7	113.9	.80	1.04	.86	1.12
UNITED STATES	78/76	217,563	3,087,623	6,346,731	156,504.2	156,504.2	14,608.0	1,503.8	16,111.8	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.27
	80/78	222,095	3,077,036	6,258,745	183,277.9	183,277.9	18,262.0	1,167.3	19,429.3	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.26
	81/79	224,567	3,117,868	6,383,503	194,621.8	194,621.8	19,938.6	1,347.1	21,285.7	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25
	82/80	227,156	3,059,263	6,570,348	215,524.1	215,524.1	21,879.3	1,591.8	23,471.1	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25
	83/81	229,307	3,023,233	6,746,217	236,055.0	236,055.0	23,048.5	1,608.4	24,656.9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.26

* 83/81 identifies 1983 as the fiscal year of appropriations (F,Fa,Fb), and 1981 as the year for support data (A,B,C,D,E,G,H).